

Gest, Joseph S.
 Gilley, Kenneth D.
 Gilbert, Glen G.
 Goss, David E.
 Goza, Joel L.
 Green, William W.
 Griffin, Frank H., III
 Hagstrom, Clarence E.
 Jr.
 Hamilton, Robert E.
 Harkins, Thomas G.
 Hartnady, James P., Jr.
 Haskett, Robert C.
 Heinzelman, Charles W.
 Henes, Clifford C., II
 Hensley, Robert W.
 Henthorne, Norris G., III
 Hering, John C.
 Hinton, Allyn J., Jr.
 Hire, Michael G.
 Hopwood, Thomas J.
 Howes, Paul A.
 Hugenberg, Paul B., Jr.
 Ingram, David H.
 Irwin, Thomas H. H.
 Jacobs, David H.

Jankiewicz, Barry E.
 Jeranek, Robert W.
 Johnson, Maxwell O.
 Johnson, Robert W., Jr.
 Kelly, John R.
 Kinsell, Thomas W.
 Kocevar, Frank L.
 Kranz, Dwight D., Jr.
 Lahlum, Philip A.
 Larkin, Roy A.
 Leet, David L.
 Lenz, Randolph W.
 Liljenquist, Blaine L.
 Little, Thomas E., Jr.
 Lockwood, Carl J.
 Loughlin, Thomas E.
 Mack, John M.
 Mack, Robert J.
 Martin, Stephen M.
 Mason, Richard L.
 Masterson, Rodney G.
 McCarty, Michael R.
 McCoy, Charles P.
 McDonald, Ian F.
 McKeithen, Michael B.
 McLane, Richard E., II
 McLaughlin,
 Michael J., Jr.
 McNerney, Jon M.

Merritt, James F., III
 Mitchell, Joseph A., Jr.
 Mitchell, Robert B.
 Nunan, Timothy P.
 Orth, Thomas M.
 Owen, Jerry D.
 Owens, Mackubin T.
 Paul, James J.
 Peters, Don P., III
 Peters, William G.
 Peterson, Harry W., III
 Pittman, James G.
 Porisch, Karl J.
 Porrello, Richard D.
 Porter, Joseph E., III
 Priestler, Frederick C.
 Prosser, Lloyd H.
 Fyle, Wilton S.
 Rabold, Raymond C.
 Raee, Raymond C.
 Rainey, Gary D.
 Rigby, Jesse W.
 Rodatz, Christian A.
 Rollings, Wayne E.
 Ronald, Jeffrey T.
 Ross, Ronald D.
 Sample, Martin D.
 Shinn, Robert A.
 Silva, Herbert P.

Simon, David S.
 Smalligan, Paul T.
 Solhan, George
 Stanislaw, Louis J.
 Steinmuller, John E.
 Stevens, Arnold T., Jr.
 Stiehl, James H.
 Storm, Dennis M.
 Stough, Gary E.
 Struble, John M.
 Terlecki, James E.
 Todd, Gary G.
 Towers, Donigan D.
 Trammell, Thomas B., Jr.
 Trapnell, Byron N.
 Tretsch, Robert A., Jr.
 Tucker, William T.
 Turner, Thomas D.
 Vanhuss, Earnest A.
 Voll, Richard B.
 Waimey, Stephen T.
 Whittington, William R.
 Widdison, Alan K.
 Wilkinson, Donald E.
 Williamson, Rickey D.
 Wood, Walter J.
 Woodard, Claude V.

The following named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Bensley, Albert M.	Hughes, Edwin D.
Bumm, Marcus J.	Lakin, John H.
Dean, Charles G., Jr.	Maloney, David P.
Flood, Michael L.	Maxfield, Keith L.
Goodrich, Robert B.	Potten, Milton E., Jr.
Graff, John P.	Randel, Kerry O.
Hayes, Thomas W.	Silvoso, Joseph A.
Hedin, Richard A.	Whitaker, Robert L.
Hucks, Robert P.	

The following named (U.S. Air Force Academy Graduate) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Ewers, Richard G.

The following named (staff noncommissioned officers) for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Blum, William F.	Jones, Delver J.
Bolton, Gilbert H.	Warrington, Francis P.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Champion Steer Given to Junior Village Youngsters

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the opportunity to visit the Department of Agriculture at the invitation of Secretary Orville L. Freeman to congratulate young Randy Helms, of Holbrook, Nebr., the owner of the grand champion steer at the National Western Stock Show.

My interest in young Helms and his prize steer, "Big Red," stems from the fact that the fine animal was purchased by the Denver Hilton Hotel, which is located in my congressional district, for the sum of \$10,867.50—or \$10.35 per pound.

The Denver Hilton Hotel turned Big Red over to Secretary Freeman and he donated the animal to the children of Junior Village here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I include a news release relating to the presentation ceremony on Wednesday, March 13, and Secretary Freeman's remarks on that occasion in the RECORD at this point:

WESTERN GRAND CHAMPION STEER TO BE PRESENTED TO JUNIOR VILLAGE YOUNGSTERS

WASHINGTON, March 11, 1968.—Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman will officiate at a ceremony on Wednesday, March 13, at 10:30 a.m., during which Big Red, top prize winning steer of the National Western Stock Show, will be presented to the children of Junior Village.

District of Columbia Mayor Walter E. Washington will accept the grand champion steer at the presentation to take place in the Patio of the U.S. Department of Agriculture

Administration Building, 13th Street and Jefferson Drive, S.W. Big Red was purchased for the highest price paid for a steer at the annual National Western Stock Show held in Denver, Colo., last January.

Randy Helms of Holbrook, Nebraska, who raised the prize beef, received \$10.35 a pound from the Denver Hilton Hotel for the 1,050 pound animal.

Twenty months ago the 17-year-old Randy purchased Big Red, a one-day-old calf, for \$46.

After buying the steer, the Denver Hilton turned it over to Secretary Freeman for an appropriate use. The Secretary decided to give it to the children of Junior Village.

Nash Castro, director of the National Capital Region of the National Park Service, will take custody of the steer from Mayor Washington. The steer will be kept at the Oxon Hill Children's Farm, operated by the National Park Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior. This will permit the Junior Village youngsters to visit their champion. It also will give other urban children a chance to see a fine farm animal.

Randy, who will accompany Big Red to Washington, D.C. for the ceremony, is a member of the 4-H Club and Future Farmers of America (FFA). He recently received a check for \$1,000 from the American Polled Hereford Association for his accomplishment in raising Big Red.

Randy is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Helms of Holbrook. He entered Big Red in the Nebraska State Fair at Lincoln last September and the Grasslands Livestock Show in North Platte, Nebraska, last October. The steer took first place in its class in each show. Then he went on to the National Western Stock Show.

TEXT OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FREEMAN'S REMARKS AT "BIG RED" CEREMONY, WASHINGTON, MARCH 13, 1968

We are here today to celebrate one of the many, many things that are right with America.

We are here to celebrate a Cinderella story—the kind of story we love, because we know that here in America it still can, and does, come true.

The story begins about 21 months ago, on June 17, 1966. A boy and his dad went to a livestock auction and there a day-old, white-faced, polled Hereford calf caught the boy's eye.

Whether he had a hunch or whether he just thought the calf was cute, young Randy Helms yielded to an impulse.

He bought that calf—for \$46.00—and he took it home to nurse on a milk cow.

With remarkable foresight, Randy called his calf "Big Red."

Today Randy's cute calf is "Big Red" in fact as well as in name—1,050 pounds of modern-type beef animal with, in words of the judges, "plenty of stretch and smoothness without excessive wasty fat."

Last Fall Randy had no idea of "Big Red's" lineage. He just knew "Big Red" was out of the ordinary.

So he entered him in the Nebraska State Fair at Lincoln last September—and he won.

Then he entered him in the Grasslands Livestock Show in North Platte, Nebraska, last October—and he won.

He entered him in the National Western Stock Show in Denver in January—where he came up against 397 other steers in the Hereford Division of the Junior Show—and he won.

Then "Big Red" faced the winners of the Junior Show's Angus and Shorthorn champions—and still he won.

Finally, he stood up against the toughest competition of all, the breed champions in the open steer class, representing the best of 318 open class entries—and again he won.

"Big Red" is Grand Champion Steer of the 1968 National Western Stock Show.

Remember, I said, that Randy bought him for \$46.00. He sold him to the Denver Hilton Hotel for a record \$10.35 a pound—or a total of \$10,867.50. All told, including a check from the American Polled Hereford Association and his premiums for winning in other classes, "Big Red's" earnings are just short of \$12,000.

I cite these details because they add up to a classic example of the American dream—building an inauspicious beginning into a great success, a pittance into a comparative fortune, climbing out of nowhere to the top.

I do not say this is the type of thing that happens only in America—I do say it happens far more often in America than anywhere else in the world. It's one of the many, many things that are right with America.

But this is not all. We have here also a dramatic illustration of what's right with American youth.

I've said before, and I want to repeat it, I am fed up to the teeth with the shrill, raucous, carping chorus of what's wrong with America and what's wrong with American youth.

Certainly, there is plenty that needs to be improved—but there's also a very great deal that is eminently right—and I think one of the things that is right with America is its young people.

We hear a great deal about the antics of a handful of over-age "teeny-boppers" and a few draft card burners, but we hear very little about the thousands of young Americans in the Peace Corps—and in VISTA.

We hear all too little about the quarter of a million of American college students who last year volunteered to help the needy who have been deprived of basic education.

We hear all too little about the half a million high school seniors who volunteer their free hours to help youngsters in the grade schools.

I think it is important to give "equal time" to what's right in America—such as the accomplishment of 17-year-old Randy Helms and his family.

Randy didn't win this Grand Championship with "Big Red" simply by wishing for it. No, it came as the end result of a lot of preparation and hard work. Randy started livestock projects in 4-H ten years ago. He is now in his fourth year in the Future Farmers of America program.

Moreover, the raising of "Big Red" was a family project—it couldn't have been done without the help of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Helms and Randy's brothers, Dickie and Bruce.

So I am personally proud to take part in this ceremony. I congratulate all who have helped make it possible—Mayor Washington, the Hilton Hotel chain, the National Park Service, and others.

But especially, I congratulate and commend Randy Helms and his family for proving once again that Cinderella stories do come true in our day—and for proving again what is right with America and American youth.

The Impact of Housing Patterns on Job Opportunities

HON. EDWARD W. BROOKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, last week the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing published a valuable report on "The Impact of Housing Patterns on Job Opportunities."

I have always believed, and I feel certain that all other Senators would agree, that jobs are the key to the future of this Nation and its people. It is through improved job opportunities that the cycle of poverty can be broken, the despair of the ghettos lifted, and the promise of American life fulfilled.

The report points out in vivid detail the impact which industrial decentraliza-

tion has had upon the residents of the inner city. As industry has moved to the suburbs, it has taken with it the very jobs—skilled, semiskilled, and non-skilled—which are most needed by the ghetto residents. Because of discriminatory patterns in housing these people are not able to go where the jobs are. The unemployment rate rises, discontent rises, and the results, as we have seen, are often explosive.

The fair housing amendment which passed this body by an overwhelming majority on March 11 would go a long way toward alleviating the problem of housing discrimination as a barrier to fuller and fairer employment.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMPACT OF HOUSING PATTERNS ON JOB OPPORTUNITIES

INTRODUCTION

Business leaders and government officials who are concerned about the plight of the American city and the economic depression of the Negro confined within its ghettos will find that this report warrants their serious consideration. The primary focus of the NCDH study is on the relationship between access to housing and job opportunities. It also examines a variety of complex, interrelated factors which impede the upward mobility of millions of disadvantaged Americans.

The complexity of the race-related problems which underlie or cut across most of the city's troubles can scarcely be overstated. Nor can the threatening implications for the future of our cities be exaggerated. If we as a nation measure our future prospects in human relations by our past record, the outlook for building a healthy, open society of free men and women seems bleak. The outlook is bleak not because our problems are insoluble; not because we do not have the intellectual, material or financial resources to seek and obtain solutions. We have mastered many crises in our history when we have demonstrated that we have the will and the commitment to master them. There are signs on the horizon that the American businessman is beginning to stimulate and mobilize that will.

During the last year, a substantial and steadily growing number of the nation's corporate leaders have become deeply involved in efforts to find lasting solutions to the critical problems confronting our metropolitan areas. The significance of this development is reflected in a recent special issue of *Fortune* magazine given over to "Business and the Urban Crisis" (January, 1968). The editors took as their major theme the proposition that "the crisis in race relations is of manageable proportions," and find the emergence of businessmen in leadership roles as "one of our principal hopes."

An insidious idea is abroad that Negroes want to be segregated; that they support the repudiated *Plessy v. Ferguson* doctrine of "separate, but equal"; that their goal is to make the black ghetto "equal" to the white citadel; that the withdrawal philosophy preached by a relatively small group of black nationalists reflects the desires of the Negro masses. This notion runs counter to every valid survey that has been made—Gallup, Kraft, Harris, among others. Yet in the halls of government and among some white liberals the separatist concepts is being promoted as what "the Negro" wants and as the answer to his problems.

Like previous polls, *Fortune's* scientifically-conducted study found that Negro Americans want more education for their children, more good jobs, and less segregation. Ninety-three per cent want desegregation in schools, jobs, and neighborhoods; 12 per cent want total integration; and only 5 per cent were opposed to integration in any form. The vast majority of Negro citizens, *Fortune* found, oppose violence and rioting. But the editors warn white America that much of the current action aimed at improving the desperate conditions of the minority poor "was triggered by the riots." And we should add that attempts to "prevent riots" by gilding and reinforcing ghettos—trying to make them "separate and equal"—are bound by the momentum of history to boomerang.

The American business community, with its unique capacity to assemble and analyze facts, its vast organizational resources, and—above all—its traditional "will to succeed," is in a strategic position to stimulate public and private action embracing all aspects of the urban crisis and to reverse the defeatist attitude which is immobilizing government programs and spreading confusion in political and intellectual circles.

Moreover, there are strong economic reasons for business to provide leadership in efforts to rid this nation of a ghetto system which is increasingly destructive of both financial and human resources. Every economist will agree that the free enterprise system can survive and prosper only under conditions of stability in our urban society. The Council of Economic Advisers has estimated that ending racial discrimination would result in an increase in the gross national product of some \$27 billion. Millions of impoverished dependents could become productive, self-supporting consumers.

"The new wisdom about the cities," *Fortune* observes, "begins with an awareness that race and housing and jobs and education and welfare all interact."

That statement represents the dominant theme of this NCDH study—with one essential revision: The "new wisdom" cannot be effective unless it is applied to entire metropolitan areas. For jobs are moving to the outskirts of the city and to presently all-white suburban communities, while the masses of unemployed and under-employed Negroes remain trapped in central city ghettos.

In the light of these facts, it is not an overstatement to assert that the crisis of our cities cannot be solved until the American people become committed to the obtainable, though difficult, goals of planning for and achieving a slum-free and a ghetto-free society. Such goals can be obtained only through the development and implementation of realistic programs to open up the ghettos of American cities in order to provide for Negroes the same freedom of choice and mobility which the United States has provided for all other ethnic groups—including the freedom to travel to, move to, and to live near jobs. At the same time there must be a serious effort to include Negroes in all aspects of the economic life of this nation. Such an effort means comprehensive programs that will provide a basis for solid economic growth, and therefore will benefit all Americans.

A SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS OF THIS STUDY

The primary conclusion to be drawn from this preliminary study of where people live and where the jobs are is that residents of the nation's racial ghettos are severely handicapped in their search for employment by housing market conditions and discriminatory practices. Nonwhites and other minorities increasingly are contained in circumscribed areas of central cities; employment opportunities increasingly are locating in

outlying sections and suburban communities where Negroes are denied access to living accommodations. In short, jobs are moving beyond the geographic reach of those who need them most.

As a consequence, the cities—more and more the habitat of the elderly, the black, and the poor—are plagued by a multiplicity of problems not the least of which is the social dynamite bred by extreme poverty, deprivation and racial discrimination. The economic and operational problems of city governments, business interests, and community institutions are pyramiding, and the people of the city are ever more stripped of essential services.

Where people live

The proportion of the nation's Negro population living in rural areas and urban areas has undergone a *total reversal* during the last 50 years: 73 per cent rural in 1910 to 73 per cent urban in 1960.

Eighty per cent of all Negroes living in urban (metropolitan) areas in 1960 lived in central cities, contrasted with less than 50 per cent of the urban white population.

Between 1960 and 1966, the white population in central cities declined by 900,000, despite an increase of over 10 million whites living in metropolitan areas.

By 1966, only 27 per cent of the nation's white population lived in central cities, compared with 55 per cent of the total Negro population.

The increasing color separation between center city and suburbia is exemplified by the counter movement of population in metropolitan Baltimore. Between 1940 and 1960, the center city nonwhite population grew from 19.4 to 35.0 per cent. During the same period, while the white population in Baltimore's suburban ring grew by 196.8 per cent (from 247,171 to 733,592), the nonwhite proportion of the suburban population shrank from 11.9 to 6.9 per cent.

Unemployment and underemployment

For almost 20 years nonwhite unemployment rates have fluctuated between $1\frac{1}{2}$ and $2\frac{1}{2}$ times those for whites.

In *non-poverty* areas recently surveyed, unemployment for nonwhites was 7.2 per cent compared with 3.6 per cent for whites.

In *poverty* areas, the unemployment rate for nonwhites was 9.4 per cent, contrasted with 6.0 per cent for whites.

Figures from the U.S. Labor Department's new index of "sub-employment" are even more staggering. This index includes the unemployed, heads of households earning less than poverty-level wages, part-time workers, etc. Average sub-employment was found to be 34.6 per cent in ghetto areas recently surveyed in eight cities over the nation, while the conventional unemployment rate in these areas had been shown as 10 per cent.

The unemployment rate for nonwhite males from 14 to 19 years of age was 31 per cent; for females in this age group, 46 per cent.

If nonwhites continue to hold the same proportion of jobs in each occupation, by 1975 the unemployment rate for Negroes will be more than five times that for the labor force as a whole.

Where the jobs are

The overwhelming proportion of new jobs created in recent years have been located outside the center cities in areas where Negroes are denied housing either by overt discrimination or lack of moderate-cost accommodations.

A recent Bureau of Labor Statistics study shows that from 1960 to 1965 at least 62 per cent of valuation permits for new industrial buildings and 52 per cent of those for mercantile establishments were for construction in the suburbs.

The actual number of jobs has declined in many major cities. For example, from 1951 to 1965, St. Louis City lost 62,000 jobs; Philadelphia lost 49,000. Even in cities where slight gains have been made in clerical and white collar employment, there has been a loss in semi-skilled and unskilled jobs. Manufacturing jobs in New York City dropped by almost 50,000 from 1962 to 1965, with an additional decline of some 6,400 jobs in trade; San Francisco lost 4,400 jobs in manufacturing, and 1,100 in trade.

In the five cities covered by this study (Baltimore, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis and San Francisco), from 1951 to 1965 manufacturing employment decreased by some 360,000 jobs.

Commutation is not a practical solution for reducing the disparity between job location and the housing location of minorities: it is prohibitively expensive; excessively time-consuming; and the ghetto poor are in no position to maintain the automobiles necessary for most commuters. For instance, to commute from Hunter's Point in San Francisco to a job in suburban Contra Costa County in the East Bay area would cost \$3.00 per day, consume four to five hours in daily travel time, and would involve three or four transfers. In many cases, public transportation is not available from center cities to suburban plant locations.

Disparities in training

Unpublished figures for enrollment in Government training programs indicate that nonwhites, particularly young Negroes, are being seriously shortchanged.

The majority of Negro participants are being trained for those jobs which are the lowest paid and offer the least chance for advancement.

Those in most critical need of training are Negro males; the largest percentage of Negro enrollees are females.

Most of the Negro enrollment in manpower training programs is for vocational courses under the Institutional programs, with Negro males comprising about 31 per cent of total male enrollment and Negro females accounting for 42 per cent. Under this program, the enrollee must still search for a job when the training is completed.

Those enrolled in On-the-Job Training programs are salaried while they learn and generally have a job when they complete the course. Under OJT, 98 per cent of the Negro trainees (96 per cent of the whites) obtained work related to their training. Yet Negroes comprise only 13.8 per cent of all OJT trainees, whereas they make up 35.9 per cent of the less advantageous Institutional program enrollment.

The racial disparity in Government training programs becomes even greater when examined by occupational breakdown. Negroes training under the Institutional program for metal-working jobs make up 25 per cent of the enrollment; but Negroes are only 10 per cent of all metal-working trainees in the On-the-Job program. In building trades, Negroes are 26 per cent of the Institutional trainees; but only 18 per cent of the OJT enrollees. For lower paying jobs in hospitals, hotels and restaurants, nonwhites make up 40 per cent of the Institutional trainee enrollment and 34 per cent of the enrollment for OJT.

The types of industry which are locating in the suburbs are precisely those most amenable to OJT programs. Therefore, exclusionary housing patterns must be recognized as a likely deterrent to Negro participation in this most advantageous of the manpower training programs.

Toward a rational solution

Present programs, public and private, to deal with the problems of minorities and the poor are diffuse, confused, piecemeal, and

totally uncoordinated. As a result, little is being accomplished in lifting the burden of unemployment and under-employment from the backs of Negroes, other minorities, and poor whites as well.

The only rational solution lies in comprehensive, metropolitan-wide planning and programming which embraces all of the economic, social and political factors affecting community life: housing, education, training, employment, health, transportation, cultural amenities, economic development, and—above all—human dignity and freedom.

The American business community has demonstrated that successful solutions to problems are achieved by decisions, plans and action based on reliable and comprehensive information. The questions raised in the closing section of this report point the way toward developing minimum standards for sound planning and should be used as guidelines for action by every politician, legislator, planner, businessman, community leader—anyone—who is seeking to shape the economic and social destiny of this increasingly urban society.

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

This study is concerned with the movement of jobs from city to suburb and the relationship between access to housing and employment opportunities. The relocation of existing jobs to outlying areas and the creation of new ones away from the city proper have become increasingly apparent over the last decade and a half. This large-scale shift of industrial and service occupations has been accompanied by accelerated exodus of a freely-mobile white middle class out of central cities to surrounding suburban communities, while Negroes and other minority group citizens have remained trapped in racial ghettos in the older urban core.

At a time of unprecedented affluence for the vast majority of white Americans, the unemployment rate among Negroes and other minorities continues to mount to overwhelming proportions in the face of continuous promises of social reform. The inevitable result has been discontent, hopelessness and eruptions of violence, as well as widespread degeneration of the economic, social and moral health of the entire society—white and nonwhite, poor and affluent.

Indeed, the crisis mushrooms as the quality of education, housing supply, training programs and general standards of life are raised in the suburbs in contrast with their steady decline in the inner city. For along with the major shift of population to outlying communities, many suppliers of vital services have left the city for suburbia. For example, the exodus of the middle class often means the exodus of an alarming number of highly competent teachers, of moderate-cost cultural facilities such as theater groups, and of many personal services. The cities are left to the few very rich who meet their needs and desires from their own substantial resources, and to the many poor who often must fend for themselves. City governments, business and commercial interests, educational and health facilities, religious and cultural institutions are faced with formidable economic and operational problems as the city's old and its poor mount in numbers. The people living in the city are stripped, more and more, of the services and advantages which are essential for raising the achievement level of those members of society who have been culturally and economically deprived.

The end result is a caste system of dangerous magnitude—a nation of two communities, isolated and alienated by class as well as race.

In recent years, spreading turmoil in urban America has compelled both government and the private sector to give increasing attention to resolving the critical and complex problems which stem from the ghetto system. Efforts to find practical and effective solutions, however, have become even more complicated by differences among many of the nation's social and economic planners as to goals, strategies, techniques and program priorities.

Nevertheless, whatever the differences, one overriding fact seems indisputable: the American city—the center of commerce and culture for the entire metropolitan region—is doomed to economic strangulation, physical decay, and social disruption unless solutions are sought and programs instituted on an interrelated regional basis. The most fervent attempts to improve the life of those confined in the nation's dark ghettos cannot eliminate poverty, deprivation and racial alienation unless the increasing movement of employment opportunities to suburban localities is taken into account, and unless workers—regardless of race—are able to live in reasonable proximity to their jobs.

Analysis of the employment picture of the nation's metropolitan areas, both of the real and potential supply of labor and of the location of jobs, reveals the social and economic implications of current trends. It exposes in dramatic fashion some of the basic causes for the frustration experienced and expressed by the inner city's minority populations.

This report begins with a broad overview of population movements in metropolitan areas, with particular emphasis on the shifts in selected regions since 1940. It goes on to examine unemployment and under-employment by race and geographic area; the movement of job opportunities to outlying communities; and the actual effect of manpower training programs undertaken by the Federal Government.

Most importantly, this study—which focuses primarily on the extent to which job opportunities for Negroes and other minorities are cancelled out or severely limited by conditions and practices which restrict the housing market along racial lines—points to the urgent need for continued and more expansive research into the relationship between education, training, employment, housing, transportation, and industrial development. It prescribes the direction for a thorough investigation of available opportunities for economic development both within the cities and outside of them. Such an investigation has not thus far been undertaken, although in 1964 John F. Kain, U.S. Air Force Academy and the Rand Corporation (now of the Department of Economics, Harvard University), examined the relationship between Negro place of residence and its limitations on place of work in Detroit and Chicago ("The Effect of the Ghetto on the Distribution and Level of Nonwhite Employment in Urban Areas," *Proceedings, Social Statistics Section, American Statistical Association*, 1964, pp. 260-272). In a later article, Kain presented a picture of general population and employment shifts since World War II ("The Distribution and Movement of Jobs and Industry," from *The Metropolitan Enigma*, published by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1967).

Finally the last section of the report raises a number of questions which should be resolved if workable strategies and sound programs for dealing with the urban crisis are to be developed. In many respects this final section is most critical because it offers the essential mechanism for launching effective programs by corporate leaders, labor unions, religious and other community institutions, foundations, and public planning agencies.

The National Committee Against Discrim-

ination in Housing (NCDH) presents this preliminary examination of employment opportunity *vis-a-vis* place of residence in the hope that it will help to establish guidelines for the development of a realistic national strategy and pragmatic program priorities for meeting the most urgent domestic problem confronting this nation.

I. POPULATION MOVEMENTS

The current crisis in urban America stems in part from redistribution of the nation's population, accompanied by increasing separation along racial lines. Recent decades have witnessed the large-scale migration of Negroes from the South to other regions of the country, from rural areas to central cities in the South as well as in other parts of the nation, and their confinement largely to circumscribed tracts within the city proper. At the same time, a massive shift of whites from inner cities to suburban communities has occurred. The result has been mounting isolation of both whites and blacks.

The outward movement of whites from city to suburb began accelerating at a rapid pace after World War II when an acute shortage had developed in the nation's housing supply following a decade and a half of economic depression and world conflict. The Federal Government, in partnership with private industry, had instituted programs to offer house-hungry American families of modest means the opportunity to buy a home. Most of this new housing was located on the outer edges of the city or in the suburbs where land for development was available. Lenient terms of purchase provided for low down payments and long-term, federally-guaranteed mortgages. But, with the exception of a scattering of small all-Negro subdivisions, these Government-supported programs barred Negroes and other minorities—even those who could afford new suburban homes.

Soon the cities were ringed by huge new exclusively white communities. Young white families left the cities *en masse* to become home-owning suburbanites. Negroes fell heir to the older and often dilapidated housing vacated by whites in designated parts of the inner city.

Manifestly, the exodus of the white middle-class from the cities must be attributed to many factors: affluence; a preference for open space and fresher air; more room for children, both inside and outside the house; the status symbol represented by home ownership; a search for improved educational, recreational, and other community facilities—to name only a few.

There are also indications, heightened in recent years, that many whites have left the urban center in response to the increasing growth of the proportion of nonwhites in the total city population.

The Negro population in the United States has been undergoing a vast locational change for more than 50 years. Between 1910 and 1950, there was a massive movement of Negroes from the South in search of jobs and expanded opportunity in the urban North and West. During that 40-year period, the Negro population outside of the South increased by more than 3,700,000 or 134.7 per cent. The magnitude of this migration of Negroes from the South becomes even more dramatic when compared with the 63.8 per cent increase of the total population in the nation during those same years. Moreover, while the northern and western Negro population was increasing by 134.7 per cent, the southern Negro population grew by only 16.9 per cent. During the 1950's, an additional 1,500,000 Negroes moved northward and westward, while an unknown number within the South moved from rural areas to cities. The "northward" movement during the 1950's centered in seven states: California, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Michigan. Together

with the District of Columbia, these states contained 35 per cent of the total Negro population in the United States in 1960.

In the course of these 50 years (1910-1960), the proportion of the nation's Negro population living in the North and West increased from 11 per cent to 40 per cent. Even more significantly, the percentage of Negroes living in rural and urban areas of the United States underwent a *total reversal* from 73 per cent rural in 1910 to 73 per cent urban in 1960.

Negro Americans have not only become urban dwellers; they are concentrated within central city areas to an extent wholly at variance with their proportion of the urban population. Eighty per cent of the Negroes living in metropolitan areas in 1960, for example, resided in central cities, compared to slightly less than 50 per cent of all urban whites. In 1960, the central cities of the nation's metropolitan areas contained 51 per cent of the total Negro population in the United States, compared with 30 per cent of the total white population.

Karl E. Taeuber, Professor of Sociology, and Alma F. Taeuber, Research Associate, Institute for Research on Poverty—both of the University of Wisconsin—have constructed a statistical index to measure residential segregation, based on their scientifically-documented study of housing patterns in 207 American cities (*Negroes in Cities*, 352 pages. Aldine Publishing Company, 64 East Van Buren St., Chicago, Ill. 60605). The Taeubers found that if a segregation index of zero were to be attained (that is, Negroes and whites residing in residential areas on a random basis), the movement of some 86.2 per cent of the urban Negro population to all- or predominantly-white neighborhoods would be necessary.

As noted above, this massive northward and urban-directed Negro migration was accompanied by an equally massive movement of whites out of the center cities to surrounding suburbs. Thus far in the 1960's, these outlying areas have absorbed nearly 90 per cent of the urban white population growth for the nation.

This process of suburbanization of whites has not yet run its course. As Negroes move into the dwelling units and schoolrooms vacated by the more affluent whites who are free to move at will, a second wave of suburbanization appears to have begun. There is evidence that this current outward flow involves many families of lower middle-class status. In New York City, for example, the borough that has experienced the largest net out-migration of whites during the 1960's is Brooklyn, where the population includes a large lower middle class.

Race undoubtedly was one of the many factors underlying the shift of whites from cities to suburbs during the 1950's. During the 1960's, however, race and race-related questions (whether in education, police protection, or housing) appear to have become a major consideration among many lower middle-class whites who have left the cities. There is, for example, a discernible trend toward suburbanization among many second-generation American families who have not yet reached middle-income levels.

A special report in the Current Population Series of the Bureau of the Census, issued in March 1967, shows the extent of the population shifts of the 1960's thus far. Between 1960 and 1966, *nine-tenths* of the nearly 3 million nonwhite population gain was in central cities. With this increase, well over half of the nonwhite population in the United States now lives in the urban core. The white population of central cities, on the other hand, declined during these same years by 900,000 persons, while the white population within metropolitan areas as a whole in-

creased by over 10 million. So extensive have been the twin processes of suburbanization and urban in-migration that by 1966, only

27 per cent of the nation's white population lived in central cities as compared with 55 per cent of the Negro population. The effect

of these abiding color and class changes in our metropolitan areas is shown in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

TABLE 1.—THE LEAST GROWTH IN SUBURBAN NONWHITE POPULATION WAS BALTIMORE—A MERE 21,139; SAN FRANCISCO'S INCREASE (177,885) IS INFLATED BY INCLUSION OF OAKLAND, RICHMOND, ETC., AS SUBURBS

[Population change in metropolitan areas, 1940-60]

SMSA	1940				1950				1960			
	White	Nonwhite	Total	Percent nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	Total	Percent nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	Total	Percent nonwhite
Baltimore:												
Central city.....	692,705	166,395	859,100	19.4	723,655	226,053	949,708	23.8	610,608	328,416	939,024	35.0
Suburban ring.....	247,161	33,268	280,429	11.9	409,144	46,547	455,691	10.2	733,592	54,407	787,999	6.9
New York:												
Central city.....	6,977,501	477,494	7,454,995	6.4	7,116,441	775,516	7,891,957	9.8	6,640,662	1,141,322	7,781,984	14.7
Suburban ring.....	1,194,117	57,805	1,251,922	4.6	1,589,313	74,673	1,663,986	4.5	2,766,093	146,556	2,912,649	5.0
Philadelphia:												
Central city.....	1,678,577	252,757	1,931,334	13.1	1,692,637	378,968	2,071,605	18.3	1,467,479	535,033	2,002,512	26.7
Suburban ring.....	1,184,217	84,086	1,268,303	6.6	1,494,484	104,959	1,599,443	6.6	2,194,108	146,277	2,340,385	6.3
St. Louis:												
Central city.....	706,794	109,254	816,048	13.4	702,348	154,448	856,796	18.0	534,004	216,022	750,026	28.8
Suburban ring.....	604,845	43,218	648,063	6.7	799,649	62,843	862,492	7.3	1,228,221	81,856	1,310,077	6.2
San Francisco:												
Central city.....	602,701	31,835	634,536	5.0	693,888	81,469	775,357	10.5	604,403	135,913	740,316	10.3
Suburban ring ¹	794,372	32,896	827,268	4.0	1,336,332	129,078	1,465,410	8.8	1,832,262	210,781	2,043,043	18.4

¹ Includes Solano County.

Source: U.S. Census of Population.

TABLE 2.—COMPOSITION OF SUBURBAN RING COUNTIES IN 5 YEARS OVER A 20-YEAR PERIOD IS SHOWN BELOW. DURING THIS TIME, ST. LOUIS' JEFFERSON COUNTY ACTUALLY LOST 169 NONWHITE RESIDENTS; ST. CHARLES LOST 104

[Population change in counties of suburban ring]

	1940				1950				1960			
	White population		Nonwhite population		White population		Nonwhite population		White population		Nonwhite population	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Baltimore:												
Anne Arundel.....	50,524	73.9	17,851	26.1	94,800	80.8	22,592	19.2	176,045	85.2	30,589	14.8
Baltimore County.....	145,295	93.2	10,530	6.8	252,247	93.3	18,026	6.7	474,893	96.4	17,535	3.6
Carroll.....	36,973	94.7	2,081	5.3	42,850	95.4	2,057	4.6	50,584	95.8	2,201	4.2
Howard.....	14,369	83.7	2,806	16.3	19,247	83.3	3,872	16.7	32,070	88.7	4,082	11.3
New York:												
Nassau.....	393,213	96.7	13,535	3.3	655,008	97.4	17,757	2.6	1,258,039	96.8	42,132	3.2
Rockland.....	71,038	95.7	3,223	4.3	84,668	94.8	4,608	5.2	129,651	94.8	7,152	5.2
Suffolk.....	188,186	95.4	9,169	4.6	262,537	95.1	13,592	4.9	631,997	94.8	34,787	5.2
Westchester.....	541,680	94.4	31,878	5.6	587,100	93.8	38,716	6.2	746,406	92.3	62,485	7.7
Philadelphia:												
Bucks.....	105,732	98.2	1,983	1.8	142,064	98.2	2,556	1.8	302,627	98.1	5,940	1.9
Burlington.....	90,001	92.8	7,012	7.2	124,834	91.9	11,076	8.1	208,934	93.1	15,565	6.9
Camden.....	237,693	92.9	18,034	7.1	277,875	92.4	22,868	7.6	355,885	90.8	36,150	9.2
Chester.....	122,557	90.4	13,069	9.6	144,097	90.5	15,044	9.5	193,011	91.6	17,597	8.4
Delaware.....	287,912	92.6	22,844	7.4	384,636	92.9	29,598	7.1	513,991	92.9	39,163	7.1
Gloucester.....	65,441	90.6	6,778	9.4	83,000	90.5	8,727	9.5	122,391	90.8	12,449	9.2
Montgomery.....	274,881	95.0	14,366	5.0	337,978	95.7	15,090	4.3	497,269	96.2	19,413	3.8
St. Louis:												
Jefferson.....	30,999	96.8	1,024	3.2	37,170	97.8	837	2.2	65,522	98.7	855	1.3
Madison.....	142,213	95.2	7,136	4.8	172,734	94.7	9,573	5.3	212,630	94.6	12,059	5.4
St. Charles.....	24,542	96.0	1,020	4.0	29,069	97.4	765	2.6	52,054	98.3	916	1.7
St. Clair.....	145,251	87.0	21,648	13.0	171,340	83.2	34,655	16.8	214,363	81.7	48,146	18.3
St. Louis County.....	261,840	95.5	12,390	4.5	389,336	95.8	17,013	4.2	683,652	97.2	19,880	2.8
San Francisco:												
Alameda.....	490,145	95.5	22,866	4.5	654,831	88.5	85,484	11.5	768,996	84.7	139,213	15.3
Contra Costa.....	98,016	97.6	2,434	2.4	273,557	91.5	25,427	8.5	378,888	92.6	30,142	7.4
Marin.....	51,635	97.6	1,272	2.4	81,797	95.5	3,822	4.5	141,302	96.2	5,518	3.8
San Mateo.....	108,661	97.2	3,121	2.8	230,201	97.7	5,458	2.3	425,213	95.7	19,174	4.3

Source: U.S. Census of Population.

TABLE 3.—AS MIGRATION TO THE SUBURBS PICKED UP MOMENTUM, THE PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION LIVING IN THE CENTRAL CITY HAS DECREASED IN ALL CASES. BALTIMORE'S DECREASE OF 26 PERCENT IS GREATEST

[Percentage of population living in central city]

	1940	1950	1960
Baltimore.....	75.4	67.6	54.4
New York.....	85.6	82.6	72.8
Philadelphia.....	60.4	56.4	46.1
St. Louis.....	55.7	49.8	36.4
San Francisco.....	43.4	34.6	26.6

Source: U.S. Census of Population.

These changes take on even more dramatic dimensions if examined in detail. Between 1940 and 1960, for example, the City of St. Louis lost 173,000 whites, or about one-quarter of its white population. During the same years, the Negro population increased from 109,000 to 216,000, or nearly 98 per cent. The

bulk of the white families who left St. Louis City moved to St. Louis County, which is adjacent to the city proper. Between 1940 and 1960, whites in St. Louis County increased by nearly 422,000; the Negro population in the County increased by less than 7,500.

Population changes for Jefferson County, Missouri (also part of the St. Louis Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area—SMSA²), are equally startling. Jefferson County had a white population of approximately 31,000 in 1940. Twenty years later, the number of whites had increased by almost 35,000, while the Negro population in the County fell from 1,024 to 855.

² A Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA), as used by the U.S. Census Bureau, consists of a central city of 50,000 or more residents, the county in which the city is located, plus surrounding counties which are deemed economically and socially interdependent.

In the first five years of the 1960's, the white population of St. Louis County grew by some 150,000; the Negro population by about 2,000, with indications that most of the latter increase was in University City, which has a large Negro community. The percentage of persons in the St. Louis SMSA resident in the central city declined from 55.7 per cent in 1940 to 36.4 per cent in 1960.

For the New York SMSA the pattern is quite similar. Between 1950 and 1960, New York City lost nearly 476,000 whites. By 1965, the city proper had lost nearly a million whites since 1950, and had gained more than half a million nonwhites. Manifestly, if present trends continue the population of New York City will be overwhelmingly nonwhite by the end of this century. Indeed, 83.6 per cent of all Negroes living in the New York metropolitan region at the time of the 1960 census were New York City residents.

Similarly, the City of Philadelphia gained some 300,000 nonwhites from 1940 to 1960, and lost 211,000 whites.

In each of these metropolitan areas, the pattern is similar: Negroes constitute an increasingly significant proportion of the population of the central city and an extremely small proportion of the population in the rapidly growing suburbs. Demographic authorities estimate that by 1980, no less than 20 of the largest cities in the United States will be more than 50 per cent nonwhite. By the year 2,000 every city of more than 500,000 in the nation will have a Negro population of at least 40 per cent. Unless present trends are reversed, and government policies changed radically, the number of Negroes living in the nation's suburbs will not increase significantly—with the exception of older inner-ring suburbs such as Mt. Vernon and New Rochelle, New York; Evanston, Illinois; Richmond, near San Francisco, California; and the like. We must make the assumption, then, that unless a reversal in the current pattern of population movements can be brought about, in a relatively few years Negro and white citizens in the United States will have become, for all practical purposes: two separate peoples: one resident in the old central cities; the other resident in the affluent suburbs.

For even if the nation is successful in rebuilding the central cities and making them attractive to families of all races and income levels, the insistent demographic changes just described will scarcely be affected one way or the other unless racially restrictive practices and devices are eliminated throughout metropolitan regions. The future may see the development of physically improved ghettos, but ghettos they will remain until Negroes and other minorities are able to exercise the same mobility as whites and, if they choose, to leave these racial compounds for all sections of our cities and suburbs.

II. UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG MINORITIES

The persistence of widespread poverty stemming from unemployment and underemployment among the nation's minorities, particularly among nonwhites, is a most critical domestic problem in the United States today.

We have seen that although Negroes live in all sections of the country, they are heavily concentrated in the core cities of metropolitan areas. Let us now examine the unemployment and underemployment rates among nonwhites for the nation as a whole and for those who remain confined in central city ghettos, as described above.

For nearly 20 years, nonwhite unemployment rates have fluctuated between 1½ and 2½ times those for whites, depending upon the state of the national economy. The lowest unemployment rate yet achieved by Negroes in the post-World War II period occurred during the Korean War when nonwhite unemployment fell from 9 per cent in 1950 to 4.5 per cent in 1953. With the end of the Korean War, nonwhite unemployment jumped 100 per cent and remained at a very high level throughout the remaining years of the 1950's and the early 1960's. In the recession years 1958 and 1961, nonwhite unemployment rose above 12 per cent.

Although Negroes have participated to some extent in the recent expansion of the economy, the 1965 Special Census for South and East Los Angeles, taken following the Watts riot, showed that unemployment in racially-isolated areas of that city fell by only 10 per cent in the 1960's as compared with a decline of 50 per cent for the white unemployment rate. This disparity occurred despite notable increases in recent years in blue-collar employment—in construction, in manufacturing, and in service work of all types.

Of even greater significance is the fact that for the nation as a whole, nonwhite unem-

ployment is increasing relative to white unemployment despite increased military activity in Vietnam and the overrepresentation of Negroes in the armed forces, which has undoubtedly removed many potentially unemployed persons from the unemployment rolls. Between 1965 and 1966, for example, while Vietnam spending more than doubled, the unemployment rate for whites fell almost 20 per cent while the unemployment rate for Negroes fell only 9.9 per cent: from 4.1 per cent to 3.3 per cent for whites, and from 8.1 per cent to 7.3 per cent for Negroes. Not only are Negroes bearing a disproportionate share of the fighting in Vietnam, but here at home they are not participating in the economic boom that has resulted from the national investment for military purposes.

This ominous situation has gone largely unnoticed in the daily press, yet it may well signal the beginning of a new and more intensive round of joblessness among Negroes. As the report of the National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress put it, in February of 1966 "if nonwhites continue to hold the same proportion of jobs in each occupation as in 1964, the nonwhite unemployment rate in 1975 will be more than five times that for the labor force as a whole."

National unemployment rates do not reveal the extent of job-related problems confronting the masses of Negroes who are concentrated in the nation's urban ghettos. Let us look now at unemployment rates for metropolitan areas and compare them with central city and suburban figures.

In poverty areas, for example, the unemployment rate for nonwhites was 9.4 per cent, compared to 6 per cent for whites. An explanation is required in the case of this last figure, for the use of the designation "whites" in poverty areas includes, by definition, millions of Mexican-Americans and Puerto

Ricans whose unemployment problems are similar to those of Negroes. For this reason, the "white"/"nonwhite" designations do not accurately describe majority/minority employment disparity. Thus, 9.4 understates and 6 per cent overstates minority/majority unemployment in poverty areas. In non-poverty areas, white unemployment was 3.6 per cent; nonwhite 7.2.

More importantly, within poverty areas the number of nonwhites who were unemployed exceeds the number of whites who were unemployed, whereas the reverse is true for non-poverty areas. The bulk of the poor and unemployed in the largest SMSAs are Negroes, Mexican-Americans or Puerto Ricans, Negroes comprise from 81 to 96 per cent of the residents of poverty neighborhoods in Cleveland; 60 per cent of the poverty area residents of Oakland; 70 per cent in Boston; 81 per cent in Los Angeles; 65 per cent in San Francisco; 93 per cent in St. Louis.

The unemployment rates for whites and nonwhites in poverty areas and non-poverty areas in the nation's 212 SMSAs, as of March 1966, are shown in Table 4.

If unemployment rates for areas of minority concentration within a metropolitan area are compared with unemployment rates for the metropolitan area as a whole (including the poverty districts), considerable insight is gained into the disparity between white and nonwhite unemployment problems. As shown in Table 5, this study has tabulated the unemployment rates for ghetto areas in Boston, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, San Francisco, Phoenix and San Antonio, and has compared these with unemployment rates for the respective metropolitan areas.

With the exception of San Antonio, each of these slum ghettos has erupted in violence within the last three years. It is not difficult to see why.

TABLE 4.—NONWHITE UNEMPLOYMENT ACROSS THE NATION FAR EXCEEDS WHITE UNEMPLOYMENT WHETHER IN POVERTY AREAS OR NOT. IN POVERTY AREAS THE ACTUAL NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED NONWHITES IS GREATER

[Unemployment in all standard metropolitan statistical areas]¹

	Poverty sections		White number	Rate	Nonpoverty sections		White number	Rate
	Nonwhite number	Rate			Nonwhite number	Rate		
Total.....	280,000	9.4	220,000	6.0	186,000	7.2	1,197,000	3.6
Men.....	182,000	10.2	148,000	6.3	100,000	6.9	731,000	3.4
Women.....	98,000	8.1	72,000	5.4	86,000	7.6	466,000	3.9

¹ March 1966.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics Report—Monthly Labor Review, October 1966; p. 1108, vol. 89:10.

TABLE 5.—A COMPARISON OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN GHETTO AREAS WITH METROPOLITAN AREAS AS A WHOLE DURING 1966 SHOWS THE GHETTO RATE TO BE APPROXIMATELY 2 TO 4 TIMES THE METROPOLITAN AREA RATE

[Unemployment rates: Ghetto areas and surrounding metropolitan areas]

SMSA	Ghetto area	Unemployment rate	
		Ghetto ¹	SMSA ²
Boston.....	Roxbury.....	6.9	3.7
Cleveland.....	Hough and surrounding neighborhood.....	15.6	3.5
Detroit.....	Central Woodward.....	10.1	4.3
Los Angeles.....	South Los Angeles.....	12.0	6.0
	Harlem.....	8.1	4.6
New York.....	East Harlem.....	9.0	
	Bedford-Stuyvesant.....	6.2	
Philadelphia.....	North Philadelphia.....	11.0	4.3
Phoenix.....	Salt River Bed.....	13.2	
St. Louis.....	North Side.....	12.9	4.5
San Antonio.....	East and West Sides.....	8.1	
San Francisco-Oakland.....	Mission-Fillmore.....	11.1	5.2
	Bayside.....	13.0	

¹ As of November 1966.

² Average for year ending August 1966.

Source: 1967 Manpower Report of the President, p. 75; metropolitan area data are based on special tabulation of data from the Current Population Survey.

In the Hough and other slum sections of Cleveland, for example, the unemployment rate was 15.6 per cent, compared with an average for the Greater Cleveland area of 3.5 per cent. In North St. Louis, where 80 per cent of all Negroes in St. Louis City reside, the unemployment rate was 12.9 per cent versus 4.5 per cent for the St. Louis metropolitan area. In Oakland (San Francisco), the comparable figures are 13 per cent and 5.2 per cent. Indeed, the severe unemployment which the Negro experiences in the 1960's is comparable to that experienced by the American public-at-large only in the depth of the Great Depression.

Even these figures do not tell the complete story, for unemployment data constitute an inadequate index to the job-location problem of many central city residents, especially Negroes. Conventional unemployment data measure only insured unemployment, which presumes a previous and continuing work history. These data do not reckon with the extraordinarily high non-labor force participation rates among Negro males, nor with the extent of involuntary part-time work within the Negro community, nor with the full-time worker who earns less than minimum subsistence need, nor finally, with the undercount of adult Negro males in the census of 1960. This undercount has been variously estimated to be between 10 and 15 per cent.

To understand these problems more fully, the U.S. Department of Labor undertook a special survey of joblessness and poverty in 14 of the worst ghetto areas of the United States (the Department called them slums). The survey was conducted, in cooperation with state agencies, during November 1966, and the results have recently been made public. It was found, first that Negroes constituted 3 of every 4 unemployed in the areas studied and that their conventional unemployment rate was nearly 10 per cent. Among teenagers, 16 to 19 years old, the average unemployment rate was 28 per cent; the unemployment rate for nonwhite boys in the age group from 14 to 19 was 31 per cent, and for nonwhite girls, 46 per cent.

Secondly, nearly 7 per cent of the residents of the slum ghettos were employed only part time although they would have worked full time if the opportunity to do so was available. (For the nation as a whole the comparable figure was then 2.3 per cent). One out of every five working full time in these areas earned less than the basic minimum needs for a family of four, or \$60 per week. Nearly 40 per cent of the families studied reported incomes under \$3,000 as compared with one-quarter for the country as a whole. Moreover, if these 1966 figures are compared with modest but adequate income requirements in areas where Negroes are concentrated—\$7,281 for a family of four in New York City, for example—it is clear that a far greater percentage of these ghetto families were unable to escape a life marked by poverty.

Two other survey findings are useful here. An inordinately large number of ghetto residents of working age were not counted in the labor force of these metropolitan areas. Some of these individuals doubtless did not want work, but most have probably given up hope of ever securing a well-paying job. Second, more than 20 per cent of adult men who were likely to be part of the population of these 14 slum areas—given normal distributions of male and female of the population as a whole—were not located by the Department's surveys. When all of these negative factors are taken into account, the unemployment problems of Negroes and of the areas in which they are resident take on even more shocking dimensions.

As a result of these surveys, the Labor Department developed a new technique for

measuring unemployment. This new technique is called the sub-employment index, and it covers an entire employment-hardship area. The sub-employment index measures, first, those unemployed workers who are "actively looking for work and unable to find it"; second, those working part-time but seeking full-time jobs; third, heads of households earning less than \$60 per week and individuals under 65 earning less than \$56 a week in a full-time job; fourth, half the number of non-participants in the male age group 20-64 who are not in the labor force; fifth, a "conservative and carefully considered estimate of the male 'under-count' group." Sub-employment rates for the areas covered by the November 1966 survey are listed on the following page.

SUBEMPLOYMENT RATES (NOVEMBER 1966)

SMSA	Ghetto area	Subemployment rate (percent)
Boston	Roxbury	24
New Orleans		45
New York	Harlem	29
	East Harlem	33
	Bedford-Stuyvesant	23
Philadelphia	North Philadelphia	34
Phoenix	Salt River Bed area	42
St. Louis	North Side	39
San Antonio	East and West Sides	47
San Francisco	Mission-Fillmore	25

Average sub-employment for all of these cities was an incredible 34.6 per cent. This means that one out of every three residents of these racially- and ethnically-isolated communities who is already a worker or who could become a worker was unemployed, under-employed, or employed at poverty-level wages.

III. MOVEMENT OF JOBS

A 1966 report issued by the U.S. Department of Labor shows that more than half of all new industrial and mercantile buildings constructed in the United States between 1954 and 1965 were located outside of the central cities of the nation's metropolitan areas. Moreover, the movement of industry to outlying areas was found to be accelerating. This Bureau of Labor Statistics study reveals that from 1960 to 1965 at least 62 per cent of the valuation of permits issued for new industrial buildings was for construction in the suburbs, as well as 52 per cent of those for mercantile buildings.

Even in the case of community service facilities requiring large corps of employees, such as hospitals and educational institutions, the survey found that in many sections of the country most of the new structures are being erected in suburbia.

Thus, new employment opportunities in commerce, industry, construction, and various community services increasingly have located in suburban and outlying sections of metropolitan areas where, largely for reasons related to race, Negroes are denied the opportunity to live. The fact is that wherever he now lives and wherever he is likely to live in the coming years, if enforced racial segregation continues to grow, the Negro worker faces an employment handicap previously experienced by no other group in the history of this nation; denial of the opportunity to live in areas reasonably proximate to available jobs.

Tables 6, 7, and 8 show the employment figures for five of the largest Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas in the country. In these we can see the trend toward decentralization of unskilled and semi-skilled job opportunities. Two of the five central cities of the SMSA's experienced a decline in employment in the years 1951 to 1965, when Negro population growth in the central cities was taking place; three experienced only minimal gains. In St. Louis, for example, central

city employment dropped from 419,813 in 1951 to 358,013 in 1965, or by 61,800 jobs. In Philadelphia, employment dropped from 773,622 in 1951 to 724,161 in 1965, or by 49,461 jobs. In cities such as New York, Baltimore, and San Francisco, which show minimal increases in employment in these years, the increases are highly misleading, because they fail to show the decline in unskilled and semi-skilled jobs, which is statistically offset by increases in clerical and white collar employment.

The City of Philadelphia lost nearly 50,000 jobs from 1951 to 1965, but the Philadelphia ring gained 215,000 jobs.

The City of New York gained nearly 130,000 but the areas outside the city itself gained nearly 390,000 jobs during the period 1951 to 1965.

Not only has new employment centered in the suburbs, but employment in manufacturing, trade, and personal services seems to have been drawn to the suburbs as well. It is, therefore, necessary to examine carefully the assertions that automation is wiping out blue collar jobs by specific surveys of suburban industrial plants to determine what jobs have been opening up. The fact is that manufacturing employment has increased by nearly 1.5 million jobs since 1951, but almost all of this increase has taken place away from areas of Negro concentration. The situation appears even more ominous when we look at Table 9 which shows that, of the new jobs created, an overwhelming proportion are located outside center cities.

From discussions with the policy makers of these large metropolitan areas, the Chambers of Commerce and planning department officials, NCDH is convinced that the same trend will continue for all heavy industry, manufacturing, and particularly trade industries, which will increase in response to the movement of the residential population. All of these commercial operations will continue to move to the less expensive, more spacious areas in the suburbs, and, most importantly, to those areas where their clientele and work force live. As the white middle class moves out to the suburbs, the jobs will follow. The trend is further compounded by other economic factors such as the availability of space, superior transportation and communication in the suburbs, and the high cost of rent in the central cities. In other words, the two strongest incentives which determine industry's decision to locate—proximity to the work force and the financial advantages of operating outside of the crowded central city—indicate the trend is destined to continue and to become more pronounced.

The harsh economic reality is that jobs are moving to the suburbs, in some cases are being created there, which unemployed or under-employed Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans and other minority groups could fill. Yet these jobs remain closed to people who need them largely because discrimination in suburban housing, plus restrictive construction ordinances and regulations which limit the supply of moderate-cost housing, result in the enforced confinement of minority families to the city's ghettos.

Inadequate training programs, the availability and feasibility of present transportation facilities, and communication gaps between a potential labor market and employers seeking workers should be thoroughly examined. The field is open for the development of practical, sound programs to bridge the widening gap between new labor markets and residential location of the unemployed.

Indeed, it is now widely recognized both by government and commercial interests that one of the reasons the central cities are losing middle-income whites at an accelerating pace in the 1960's is the growing supply of job opportunities in suburban localities.

TABLE 6.—EMPLOYMENT PATTERN FOR THE CENTRAL CITY AND SUBURBAN RING OF 5 METROPOLITAN AREAS IS SHOWN FOR A 14-YEAR PERIOD. (FOR AMOUNT AND PERCENTAGE OF CHANGE SEE TABLE 9, P. 25.)

[Employment in central city and suburban ring (1951-65)]

	Baltimore		New York		Philadelphia		St. Louis		San Francisco	
	Central city	Suburban ring	Central city	Suburban ring	Central city	Suburban ring	Central city	Suburban ring ¹	Central city	Suburban ring
1951.....	344,446	86,333	3,008,364	304,281	773,622	372,924	419,813	154,852	342,289	283,759
1959.....	343,390	138,069	2,988,833	524,799	736,298	480,821	357,159	233,505	321,552	370,790
1962.....	340,303	146,241	3,134,721	586,677	732,347	528,518	355,739	236,321	343,232	409,889
1965.....	345,896	172,419	3,136,117	692,154	724,161	588,220	358,013	296,763	351,635	469,502

¹ Does not include St. Charles and Franklin Counties.

Source: County Business Patterns, U.S. Bureau of Census.

TABLE 7.—CENTRAL CITY MANUFACTURING AND TRADE JOBS DECREASED IN ALL 5 AREAS BETWEEN 1951 AND 1965. MEANWHILE, SUBURBAN JOBS INCREASED, WITH THE NUMBER OF MANUFACTURING JOBS LEADING EXCEPT IN SAN FRANCISCO

[Manufacturing and trade employment in central city and suburban ring (1951-65)]

	Baltimore		New York		Philadelphia		St. Louis		San Francisco	
	Central city	Suburban ring	Central city	Suburban ring	Central city	Suburban ring	Central city	Suburban ring ¹	Central city	Suburban ring
1951:										
Manufacturing.....	127,427	62,871	1,082,188	110,944	355,566	220,544	187,338	85,267	70,060	101,568
Trade.....	94,047	10,641	811,086	81,681	191,615	69,083	121,903	31,713	110,170	78,775
1959:										
Manufacturing.....	107,733	86,638	922,403	187,987	291,997	241,541	141,102	111,469	62,834	119,134
Trade.....	95,155	26,446	742,900	142,569	186,810	103,292	92,920	54,199	94,414	101,214
1962:										
Manufacturing.....	104,993	82,069	948,001	198,211	291,954	255,187	138,941	106,802	62,804	129,395
Trade.....	91,844	32,961	759,386	163,605	176,256	122,348	86,049	59,239	98,870	112,442
1965:										
Manufacturing.....	107,502	83,033	899,503	216,798	266,389	270,454	133,000	131,544	58,404	133,992
Trade.....	90,701	43,918	753,011	205,909	172,393	142,993	85,619	72,208	97,702	136,403

¹ Does not include St. Charles and Franklin Counties.

Source: "County Business Patterns," U.S. Bureau of Census.

TABLE 8.—DATA FOR CENTRAL CITY AND SUBURBAN EMPLOYMENT ARE SHOWN FOR 14-YEAR PERIOD AND ALSO THE DRAMATIC CHANGE DURING THE LAST 3 YEARS OF THE PERIOD. CONTRACT CONSTRUCTION, SERVICE INDUSTRIES ARE INCLUDED

[Employment increases in central city and suburban ring (1951-65)]

	Increase in total employment		Trade		Manufacturing		Services, real estate, finance, insurance		Contract construction	
	1951-65	1962-65	1951-65	1962-65	1951-65	1962-65	1951-65	1962-65	1951-65	1962-65
Baltimore:										
Central city.....	1,450	5,593	-3,346	-1,143	-19,925	2,509	39,989	7,925	-6,817	1,317
Suburban ring.....	86,086	26,178	33,277	10,957	20,162	964	18,241	4,909	8,369	5,781
New York:										
Central city.....	127,753	1,396	-58,075	-6,375	-182,685	-48,498	345,715	41,393	-14,160	-16,601
Suburban ring.....	387,873	105,477	124,228	42,304	105,854	18,587	127,139	38,203	16,562	4,475
Philadelphia:										
Central city.....	-49,461	-8,186	-19,222	-3,863	-89,177	-25,565	77,790	8,038	-7,056	6,580
Suburban ring.....	215,296	59,702	73,910	20,645	49,910	15,267	72,609	16,344	7,370	4,267
St. Louis:										
Central city.....	-61,800	2,274	-36,284	-430	-54,338	-5,941	29,010	2,325	591	4,677
Suburban ring.....	141,911	60,442	40,495	12,969	46,277	24,742	40,309	16,962	10,992	6,509
San Francisco:										
Central city.....	9,346	8,403	-12,468	-1,168	-11,656	-4,400	42,603	10,031	-5,411	3,074
Suburban ring.....	185,743	59,613	57,628	23,961	32,424	4,597	64,122	19,539	11,296	5,268

Source: County Business Patterns, U.S. Bureau of Census.

TABLE 9.—PHILADELPHIA AND ST. LOUIS LOST JOBS IN THEIR CENTRAL CITIES, BUT SUBURBAN JOBS INCREASED ENOUGH TO MAKE A NET GAIN FOR THESE 2 METROPOLITAN AREAS. LARGEST CITY JOB INCREASE WAS NEW YORK'S

[Employment pattern (1951-65)]

	Number of new jobs			Percent increase in new jobs		
	City	Suburbs	Metropolitan area	City	Suburbs	Metropolitan area
Baltimore.....	1,450	86,086	87,536	1.7	98.3	20.3
New York.....	127,753	387,873	515,626	24.8	75.2	15.6
Philadelphia.....	49,461	215,296	165,835	-29.8	129.8	14.5
St. Louis.....	61,800	141,911	80,111	-77.1	177.1	13.9
San Francisco.....	9,346	185,742	195,089	4.8	95.2	31.1

Source: "County Business Patterns," U.S. Bureau of Census.

Commuting is prohibitively expensive and too time consuming to be a practical solution for the average worker. For example, a resident of the center city ghetto of Philadelphia who finds a job in neighboring Montgomery County, would have to change buses at least three times, and spend about \$6.00 each week for commuter tickets. The rush-

hour trip would take about an hour and a half each way. His weekly travel expense could be reduced to \$4.80, provided he lived near the railroad station in Philadelphia and provided his job was adjacent to the station at his destination.

In Baltimore, the trip by public transportation from the inner core to a suburban job

ranges from a 40-minute ride each way at approximately \$4.00 per week to an hour's ride each way at a cost of \$15.00 per week (to Annapolis). If the worker can afford a private automobile, he can drive from the ghetto area to the Westinghouse plant in Baltimore County in about a half hour.

In New York, the monthly commutation on the Long Island Railroad alone is \$30. In St. Louis, there is no public transportation to many of the suburban areas to which jobs have moved; to other large employment centers, such as the McDonnell Aircraft Corporation, the trip from the St. Louis ghetto would cost some \$6.50 each week and total travel time each day would range from three to four hours.

A person wishing to commute from any one of the several Negro ghettos in San Francisco or the East Bay to jobs up in South San Francisco, Martinez, Livermore, or Point Richmond would find it almost impossible if he had to rely on public transportation. To commute from Hunter's Point in San Francisco to a job in Contra Costa County in the

East Bay area would require from three to four transfers, a cost of some \$15.00 each week, and four or five hours spent in travel each day. Commuting from Alameda or West Oakland to jobs in Contra Costa County would cost about \$11.50 per week, and take at least four hours daily in travel time back and forth.

Finally, public transportation schedules are planned to take care of peak rush hours and to accommodate the suburb-to-city traveler rather than those who wish to commute from city to suburb. And, of course, travel to off-hour jobs would be virtually impossible.

The journey-to-work data in Table 10 indicate that, in fact, residents of central city ghettos do not commute in significant numbers, despite suburban job growth in the five metropolitan areas studied. In addition, a comparison of nonwhite commuters with the

number of jobs which have opened up in suburban areas, also shown in Table 10, reveals the difficulty experienced by city nonwhites in reaching jobs in outlying areas and the need for immediate program response to eliminate the geographic barrier to employment opportunities.

It is clear that the whole syndrome of poverty and deprivation inflicted to such heavy degrees on residents of the nation's racial ghettos is at best exacerbated, at worst wholly determined, by the lack of opportunities for obtaining adequate income to secure improved living environments. An improved living environment often means the difference between genuine equal opportunity for advancement and no opportunity. For beyond a good house is a good school system, a culturally-rich community, and much of what makes for a meaningful chance to compete.

TABLE 10.—THE SMALL PERCENTAGE OF COMMUTERS FROM CENTRAL CITY GHETTOS REFLECTS THE COST IN TIME AND MONEY TO NONWHITE WORKERS WHO ARE DENIED THE OPPORTUNITY TO LIVE REASONABLY NEAR SUBURBAN JOBS

(Nonwhite commuting from central city to suburban jobs (1960))

	Nonwhite male commuters	Percent of work force		Total suburban employment ¹ 1959
		Central city nonwhite males	Total suburban work force 1959	
Baltimore.....	9,546	16.0	6.9	138,069
New York.....	7,007	3.1	1.3	524,799
Philadelphia.....	8,570	8.6	1.8	480,821
St. Louis.....	3,156	9.0	1.4	233,505
San Francisco.....	7,272	15.3	2.0	370,790

¹ Employment data by county not available for 1960.

Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1960—Journey to Work; County Business Patterns, 1959.

As Bayard Rustin said in *The New York Times* of August 13, 1967, "High unemployment and low income are not the only problems afflicting the black slum proletariat, but they are the crucial ones. Without adequate income, there is no access to the decent housing market, educational opportunities, even proper health care . . . it is precisely in the expansion of public facilities and social services that new employment opportunities can be generated, at varying skill levels. High sub-employment rates and the lack of decent housing in the slums are two sides of the same coin."

The physical maldistribution of labor supply and labor demand within the country as a whole and within its major urban areas must be weighed in order accurately to assess the causes of "high unemployment and low income" among minorities and to develop effective programs and policies to expand economic opportunity. For whether the immediate thrust is in basic education, job training, housing outside of the ghetto and nearer to the jobs, or developing the economic base of the ghetto, job movements must be reckoned with. If programs and strategies are not developed which will enable minority populations to compete freely in the labor market no matter where that market exists, nothing will alleviate the poverty, deprivation, and desperation of the ghetto poor and the resultant crisis confronting the cities and their people.

Anthony Downs, senior vice-president of Real Estate Research Corporation of Chicago, recently analyzed alternative strategies for dealing with the racial crisis in his paper, "The Future of American Ghettos," written for the American Academy of Arts and Sciences Conference on Urbanism (October 1967). Arguing for a national strategy to stimulate movement of nonwhites to outlying areas, he states:

"First, future job-creation is going to be primarily in suburban areas, but the unskilled population is going to be more and more concentrated in central city ghettos unless some dispersion occurs. Such an increasing divergence between where the workers are and where the jobs are will make it

ever more difficult to create anything like full employment in decent jobs for ghetto residents. In contrast, if those residents were to move into suburban areas where they would be exposed to more knowledge of job opportunities and would have to make much shorter trips to reach them, they would have a far better chance of getting employment."

Downs rejects the idea that adequate new jobs will be created in ghettos under normal free-market conditions. He stresses that "ghetto enrichment" to provide such jobs and greatly improve housing, education, and other conditions would require vast expansion of Federal financing and incentives such as tax credits to stimulate large private investment. Further, "ghetto enrichment" alone would end neither segregation nor non-white concentration in cities. He warns that merely continuing current programs and policies can lead to a shattering confrontation which would split society along both racial and spatial lines.

"Such a confrontation," he states, "would involve mainly nonwhite, mainly poor, and fiscally bankrupt central cities on the one hand, and mainly white, much wealthier, but highly-taxed suburbs on the other hand. . . . A few metropolitan areas may seek to avoid the political aspects of such a confrontation by shifting to some form of metropolitan government designed to prevent Negroes from gaining political control of central cities." Such a move, he states, would not end the segregation or poverty which generate hostility—indeed, it might increase the urban Negro's sense of frustration and alienation. "In my opinion," Downs declares, "there is serious question whether American society in its present form could survive such a confrontation."

IV. MANPOWER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Potentially, one of the most effective solutions to the growing unemployment and under-employment of the ghetto poor is investment in manpower training programs. These programs are one of the most critical areas requiring careful examination in relation to both present and future opportunities for economic advancement among mi-

norities. For manpower training focuses primarily on youth, and the Negro and other minority youth—more than any other single group—are the target population for efforts to stimulate upward mobility in the society. It is the ghetto youth who augment any true measure of unemployment; it is these young people who are now experiencing an alarmingly high rate of joblessness. Unless the problem of jobs for the young, disadvantaged members of society is dealt with effectively and immediately, tomorrow's unemployment rolls will rise to even more formidable dimensions. Further, if adequate training is not provided the ghetto youth now, his chances for employment will be more and more limited as time goes on.

Unpublished figures from the Manpower Administration of the U.S. Labor Department indicate that the number of Negro trainees does not begin to reflect the relative unemployment status of nonwhites. Moreover, by and large, Negro participants are being trained for those jobs which are the lowest paid, offer the least chance of advancement, and are not tailored to the kinds of industries which are growing in the nation as a whole nor to those which are moving out of the central cities.

Equally disturbing is the fact that the largest percentage of Negroes participating in manpower training programs are female, whereas the most critical group to reach is the Negro male. The figures show, for example, that Negro males make up 30.9 per cent of all males enrolled in the Institutional programs under the Manpower Development Training Act (MDTA), while Negro females account for 42.4 per cent of the total female enrollment. The Institutional programs under MDTA represent purely vocational training provided in the setting of an educational establishment. Thus, when the course is completed, the trainee is faced with the task of finding a job to fit his newly-acquired skill.

On-the-Job Training programs (OJT) are those which most often lead to guaranteed employment when the training period ends. The trainee learns his skill under the supervision of a regular employee. He is salaried during the training period, and generally goes directly into a full-fledged job when the learning period is completed. Under OJT 98 per cent of the Negro trainees (96 per cent of the whites) obtained positions related to their training. By contrast, only 80 per cent of the nonwhites (83 per cent of the whites) became employed in training-related jobs after participating in the Institutional program.

Thus, OJT offers far greater advantage than Institutional training. Yet Negroes comprise only 13.8 per cent of all OJT trainees, whereas they make up 35.9 per cent of the Institutional trainee enrollment. Moreover, Negro males represent only 12.2 per cent of those participating in the OJT program, with Negro females accounting for 18.9 per cent.

Placed against current estimates that the Negro unemployment rate is more than twice that for whites (and that estimate is greatly augmented if the descriptive "sub-employment" rates are used), the percentages given above underscore the gross inadequacy of Negro representation in these remedial programs.

Negroes appear to be even more short-changed if the manpower training programs are examined by occupational breakdown. Nonwhites represent 25 per cent of the metal-working trainees under the Institutional program, but only 10 per cent of all OJT metal-working trainees. Similarly, they constitute 26 per cent of the Institutional building trades trainees, and only 18 per cent of the On-the-Job building trades enrollees. However, Negroes training for work in hospitals, hotels, and restaurants make up 40 per cent of the Institutional trainee and 34 per cent

of those participating in the OJT program. Thus, the highest paying jobs which offer the greatest possibility for future advancement are not being opened to nonwhites through manpower training programs.

The urgent need for careful evaluation and strengthening of the entire manpower training effort is evident. The disparities described above, particularly with respect to Negro participation in On-the-Job training, may be due in part to geographic distribution because of the movement of plants; they may be due in part to the failure of the Government administering agencies to insure that those most in need of training and employment are made aware of the programs and are enabled to participate in them.

But once again, the impact of housing patterns on job opportunities must be taken into account. The continuing movement of industry to the suburbs involves a plethora of manufacturing and production jobs. As a consequence, the opportunity to participate in On-the-Job training is heavily dependent upon the availability of housing reasonably proximate to the plant. Nearby living accommodations are especially necessary for the young trainee who would find it practically impossible to commute daily by public transportation from the core city to the far reaches of suburbia or even to nearby outlying localities. Since population shifts, concurrent with job shifts, have been center city to suburbs for whites and containment in the inner-city for nonwhites, the assumption must be made that large numbers of unemployed and underemployed Negroes and other minorities are precluded from availing themselves of On-the-Job training, and will continue to be denied this opportunity, unless access to housing near plants is assured.

V. MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR SOUND PLANNING

The period of the 1960's has seen—with the possible exception of the early New Deal years—an unparalleled depth of concern, expenditure of time and effort, mass of legislative and executive action, and initiation by both government and the private sector of a multiplicity of programs aimed at dealing with the mammoth social and economic problems confronting the nation. These years purport to be an era when the social conscience of America has come alive.

Business and labor leaders have been in the forefront of the programming for social change: witness Plans for Progress; their equal employment opportunity promotions; their role in the Urban Coalition; investment in the ghetto; and the recent \$1 billion commitment by the insurance industry for housing programs in the slums. Philanthropic foundations—the fruits of corporate growth—have aided many successful tenant cooperatives and have been involved in both publicly-assisted and privately-financed rehabilitation programs. The whole New Town phenomenon of planned total communities rather than tract development and urban sprawl has been made possible—indeed, was instigated in this country by the business community.

To a large measure, this corporate and business involvement is a joint effort with government. The Turnkey Program to expedite building of public housing, programs of the Economic Development Administration involving business leaders, Small Business loans for expansion and training are but a few examples. And the Kennedy and Percy housing bills point to the continuing trend of developing business-government partnerships to focus on the problems of the urban poor.

The number of legislative proposals and the hours of hearings dealing with the conditions of the impoverished city dweller would be impossible to enumerate. Similarly, the Executive Branch has determined to

probe the causes of poverty and social malfunction through numerous Presidential commissions, task forces, and conferences.

But the grand total of funds and effort allocated to eradicate poverty from this richest of all nations has scarcely scratched the surface. A similar examination of the national expenditures for military purposes and highway construction programs, to cite only two illustrations, exposes the reluctance of this country to face its most dangerous domestic problem and chart practical and workable solutions in a coordinated, organized, and comprehensive manner.

Progress has been stymied by the fact that this unprecedented public and private programming to combat social ills has been diffuse, confused, piecemeal, and lacking in understanding or acceptance of the necessity for a comprehensive approach to social change and economic reform. Without any overall and unified direction, these efforts have failed even to recognize the central issue that allocation of the nation's economic resources must involve every segment of the total population.

As a consequence, there is clear evidence that little has been accomplished in lifting the burden of unemployment and underemployment from the backs of Negroes, other minorities, and poor whites as well. A recent study of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor indicates that in the Hough area of Cleveland, the proportion of poverty-stricken families increased between 1960 and 1965 from 31 to 39 per cent; the number of female-headed households increased from 23 to 32 per cent; and the median family income declined from \$4,732 to \$3,966. In the Watts area of Los Angeles, female-headed households increased from 36 to 39 per cent, and deteriorated housing increased from 14 to 21 per cent. In the slums of the nation, official unemployment rates (which admittedly do not reflect the extent of impoverishment) were as high as 9.3 per cent compared with a national average of 3.5 per cent.

Moreover, the employment figures presented earlier in this report make it clear that the situation is becoming increasingly critical as the jobs move to suburbia and Negroes and other minorities are restricted to the bounds of the center city.

The simple truth is that uncoordinated patchwork programs will not solve any problem of the magnitude and complexity of ghetto poverty and deprivation. The only rational solution lies in comprehensive planning and programming which takes into account all of the economic, social and political factors which affect community life: housing, education, training, employment, health, transportation, cultural amenities, economic development, and—above all—human dignity and freedom. These factors are inextricably linked; they are not alternatives to one another.

Although the sub-employment problem of the minority poor stems from numerous interrelated causes, there can be no question that lack of access to suitable housing is a major impediment in the ghetto resident's search for a job. Racial discrimination in the general housing market has been thoroughly documented by numerous studies. Similarly, the existence of a severe shortage of dwelling units, particularly modest-cost rental accommodations which are so important for disadvantaged families, is a fact of American life. Even so, the housing component of the urban crisis alone calls for much more detailed investigation. The possibility of redirecting Federal subsidies toward aiding minority groups and poor people in general to move where the jobs are calls for further examination.

Many unanswered questions have arisen from the analysis presented in this report, and some of these are set forth in the following pages. NCOR believes that answers to these

questions can provide the information necessary for practical planning direction under which public and private dollars and efforts could be expended to achieve effective and lasting change.

While the questions now raised indicate the need for more particularized information about specific localities, they should not be regarded as a mandate for endless study. Rather, they should be viewed as a means of establishing minimum standards for sound planning and as a guide for action by every politician, legislator, planner, businessman, community leader—*anyone*—who is seeking to shape the economic destiny of our metropolitan areas.

Gaps in basic data

What is the racial breakdown of the suburban labor force? Where does the nonwhite labor force in the suburban ring live—are new racial ghettos being created in suburbia?

Jobs are moving out to the suburbs and sizeable numbers of people, primarily white, are moving to the suburbs. Who is filling these new jobs? That is, are they substantially filled by the old work force who moved from the center city with the firms, or by a new work force from various locations? Did former minority-group employees lose jobs in the move? How many nonwhites moved with their plants to new suburban locations, and what was their experience in finding housing?

To what jobs (job classifications) do white city dwellers commute to the suburbs and to what jobs do nonwhites commute? The answer would help clarify the first questions posed which ask who are filling job opportunities in suburbia.

What can be said about the room for industrial expansion in specific geographic areas? What industries can therefore be assumed most likely to continue movement from the center city to the suburbs? Which ones could be persuaded to locate or relocate in center cities?

What is the specific breakdown of manufacturing jobs: which are office jobs and which are production jobs? A determination of this breakdown would allow for a decision on planning alternatives looking toward employment of the currently unemployed.

Does the employment increase in contract construction shown in Table 8 represent primarily residential building, or does it represent permanent employment resulting from construction of new industrial and business establishments? The same type of analysis should be made for other major industrial classifications which would help determine the persistence of current trends.

What industries are large employers paying high wages? What are the general skill levels in such industries? Which of these industries are moving to the suburbs, and which are feasible to develop in central cities?

Certain types of jobs have declined in absolute numbers in central cities. Which of these have moved to the suburbs in the same metropolitan areas, which have moved to totally new regions of the country, and which have been completely taken off the market? Charles E. Silberman, in *The myths of Automation* (Harpers & Row, 1966), suggests that automation is not as critical a problem in the removal of jobs as had been believed. The question should be investigated more fully. Certainly the data suggest that the number of manufacturing jobs in metropolitan areas is increasing. What are the skill levels of the manufacturing jobs which are increasing in number?

What are the skill levels of the unemployed and how do they relate to the skill requirements of jobs which have moved to or been created in the suburbs? What is needed to raise skill levels, what are suitable program alternatives?

What are the job vacancy and turnover rates by industrial classification, nationwide

and within specific regions? In other words, where is the most sensible place to emphasize economic development, and in what types of industries? It appears from Table 10 that because many of these jobs are new jobs, there should be continuing room for new employment opportunities.

How does the nonwhite percentage of the population in suburban rings correlate with the nonwhite percentage of the labor force and ongoing training programs in these outlying areas? Is there under-representation of nonwhites which should be corrected immediately to increase competition and employment opportunities for nonwhites already living in suburbia?

Why do the manpower training figures shown indicate unresponsiveness to the unemployment situation among nonwhites? What procedures are the administrators of the programs using to reach the unemployed and potential trainees; is the problem one of poor communication to the potentially trainable?

What is the geographical breakdown of these training programs by city and suburban ring for each metropolitan area? How many trainees are enrolled in On-the-Job training programs in job classifications which have experienced substantial moves to the suburbs—for instance, in manufacturing? Are these programs taking place primarily in areas where Negroes cannot now live? Is the disparity in nonwhite participation in OJT because the kinds of industries which have moved to the suburbs are precisely those most suitable to OJT programs?

The most critical factors affecting the non-white employment situation in newly-located suburban jobs—be they housing, training, or whatever—must be determined. To what extent is a shortage of low- and moderate-income housing proximate to available jobs a factor in current unemployment? If housing is as great a deterrent to employment opportunity as the findings of this preliminary study indicate, what can be the role of industry as well as government and labor in initiating action to remove this handicap?

Is there available and adequate transportation for commuting from the ghetto areas to jobs in suburbia? Is commutation a feasible long-range alternative to housing near jobs, or merely a stop gap?

What is the cost of bringing jobs into the ghetto compared to the cost of providing housing conditions so that minorities can move to the suburbs to fill new jobs being created there? The kind of cost/benefit analysis required here is admittedly complicated, but nevertheless must be undertaken in order to arrive at legitimate and valid planning and programming to solve the current employment/housing dilemma.

How can New Town development be used to remove the disparity between job location and residential location of the real and potential minority-group labor force? What has been the role of corporate enterprise in eliminating this disparity through New Towns?

Finally, what are the economic and social implications of current housing/employment trends, *vis-a-vis* the central city and the suburbs? On the one hand, Model Cities and other housing and community development programs of local, state, and Federal governments focus on the inner city. On the other hand, industry, in a seemingly irreversible pattern of decentralization, takes jobs to the suburbs.

Poverty is not only one of the most brutal aspects of the ghetto way of life, it is one of the most expensive drains on the economic and social health of the nation. The process of answering the above questions could lead to the kind of realistic planning and programming which would lift the burden of

the poverty cycle from this generation of Americans and their progeny as well.

The American business community has set the pattern: it has demonstrated to the world that economic growth, sound management practices, and the successful solution of problems are brought about by decisions, plans and action based on reliable and comprehensive information. Self interest alone demands that the nation's vast resources be mobilized to transform the liability of deprived millions into the asset of productive citizens. What is required is the will to wipe out a dangerous disease which threatens the very foundations of our national life.

A Fight You Want To Win

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the following editorial to my colleagues as it singles out the factor that rests most heavily on farmers. There is a remedial recommendation in the editorial that correlates the direction that many of us have and intend to continue to pursue. This appeared in the March issue of the Farm Journal, as follows:

A FIGHT YOU WANT TO WIN

Ask any farmer what's troubling him these days, and he'll start with, or soon get to, his high costs. He wonders where it will end.

Name most anything you buy, and it's higher priced. Besides that, farm help costs more, if you can find it. Bills are getting bigger for any kind of services, whether performed by doctors, lawyers, repairmen, barbers, or whoever. Taxes are skyrocketing. Yet farm prices aren't improving to match this upward march of costs.

In the last half dozen years, the prices we pay as farmers have gone up 14%. The prices we get have gone up only 5%. Your commodities might not have done that well. At any rate, we're like the fellow in the mud who took one step and slipped back two. Parity, which is a measure of the prices we get compared with the prices we pay, hasn't been so low since the depression.

In addition, farmers have gone nearly \$20 billion deeper in debt in the last six years—which is an alarming increase of 74%. Interest payments alone on the farm debt have jumped \$1.2 billion, while rates have soared to the highest level in a generation.

Most everyone else, it seems, manages to pass along his rising costs. Labor unions have an unbeatable formula—if the cost of living goes up, they strike to get wages to match it. As the industry becomes more productive, the unions ask for, and get that. Businesses, in turn, try to add the higher wages into the price of the goods you buy.

What do farmers do? Since they can't, as yet, charge more for what they raise, they "adjust"—by getting bigger, by spending more on production, by getting more efficient, and by cutting the farm income pie into fewer slices. Still they aren't keeping up with the parade. They're beginning to feel as frantic as a squirrel on a wheel: The harder they run to stay ahead, the harder they have to run to keep up.

There's one thing that can help farmers right now—this year. And that's for Congress to put the brakes on inflation. This could be the biggest help of all.

The President wants to spend more for the "Great Society" and a war half way around the globe, all at the same time. And when

the President spends more, you pay—either in taxes or through inflation.

The \$10 billion increase in the President's budget this year is \$50 more spending for every man, woman and child. That's on top of this year's budget spending, which comes to \$880 per person—which you and your family pay in our own direct taxes, or in somebody else's taxes hidden in the cost of things you buy.

There's one hitch in that arithmetic: You aren't paying the government quite that much. The deficit between tax intake and projected spending this year will run around \$20 billion. It might be more. And it will be every bit as big next year without a tax rise. And even with the 10% tax increase that the President wants, the deficit would be \$8 billion or more.

The federal government, to put it mildly, "is running a little short." So in effect, it's printing the money. The result: inflation.

Inflation, when reduced to its effect on you and me, means that we pay higher prices for what we buy. If you can somehow latch onto more income during inflation, you can stay even with the board for now. That's why labor unions and businesses are reaching so hard for higher wages and prices. Inflation is the main culprit running up your costs, your interest charges and your taxes.

That's why you have so much at stake in the struggle between the President and Congress over spending. Rep. Wilbur D. Mills (D., Ark.), the able fiscal spokesman of the House, says that his Ways and Means Committee won't approve a tax increase unless the President makes some hard cuts in his budget, not just token reductions.

The President seems just as determined to go ahead and spend—recklessly throwing gasoline on the inflation fire while throwing Congress for not trying to beat at the flames with a stick.

With financial danger lurking at every corner, it's time for fiscal leadership and responsibility. The economy minded members of Congress, led by Rep. Mills, need every assurance that you back them in this fight. Tell them so. Write them. It can do a world of good, and you'll be helping yourself. In fact this could be the most important thing you do today.

The Vietnam War

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the State newspaper, of Columbia, S.C., recently published two separate editorials on the war in Vietnam, I commend them to Senators.

The first, entitled "Win It and End It," dated March 3, discusses a speech recently delivered on the floor of the House by my good friend, Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS. MENDEL RIVERS is in a position to know as much about the conduct of the war in Vietnam as anyone in this country. In a passionate speech he warned the American people and appealed to Congress on humanitarian grounds to stop the killing in Vietnam by winning the war decisively, swiftly, and finally. The editor of the State brought out a basic truth that all should remember: that before any of the larger philosophic or moral ques-

tions on the war can be settled, the war itself must be stopped. I concur in this theory and urge Senators to concentrate on winning the war and to spend less time on theorizing and philosophizing about it. We owe at least this much to our fighting men there.

The second editorial, entitled "War and Politics," dated March 11, is a timely warning to the American people that the record of the Communist enemy is one of fighting and negotiating at the same time. Frequently the Communists consider a battle to be a symbol, and they fight it for effect and political influence as much as they do for a military victory. In this editorial, we are reminded that the North Vietnamese launched the attack Dienbienphu on the day that they had been assured that negotiations could begin. The editorial pointedly suggests that Khe Sanh might well suffer the same treatment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Mar. 3, 1968]

WIN IT AND END IT

"It is time someone stood on the floor of this House and told the American people some plain hard facts—and that is what I am going to do."

The speaker was Rep. L. Mendel Rivers. Last week, he laid it on the line to the Congress.

"Probably no war in our history has been more poorly managed . . . than the conflict in which we are involved in South Vietnam . . . and our allies—with rare and heartwarming exceptions—show little concern for our problems.

"Mr. Chairman, I am sure your blood boiled as did mine when I saw the Communist parade in Le Havre, France, on television last night—where the people of the city of Le Havre loaded a Russian ship with supplies for North Vietnam.

"This is the same port liberated by American troops 25 years ago. These are the same people whom the Communists slaughtered in Vietnam a short decade ago at Dien Bien Phu.

"Mr. Chairman, I just want the American people to never forget that the fountainhead of ingratitude lies in De Gaulle's France."

Then, Rep. Rivers turned to the matter of a possible Westmoreland dismissal.

"The question is not whether we should remove General Westmoreland and the question is whether we will ever start listening to General Westmoreland . . .

"I think, Mr. Chairman, it is time that the strategy for fighting the war in Vietnam reflected . . . the advice of those men who have led this nation to victory in other wars—men who have earned international respect for their performance in battle and less advice from the uninformed, untried, and unproven invisible civilians hidden in warm and comfortable foxholes in Washington, D.C."

It was a good speech, though it lasted less than half an hour. Rep. Rivers evidently was disturbed by films he'd seen on TV. He was disturbed and angry—as, indeed, some of the rest of us are, too. He appealed to the Congress on humanitarian grounds: The killing can only be stopped by stopping the killing. Americans hate this war; then let Americans end it—swiftly, mercifully, decisively, and finally.

Before any of the larger philosophic or moral questions of the Vietnam war can be settled, the war itself must be stopped. The North Vietnamese, and the National Liberation Front in the South, must be taught—the hard way, it seems—that the world is tired of terror and bloodshed and filthy crimes against the peasantry of South Vietnam.

"If we do not win in Vietnam," says Rep. Rivers, "all of Asia will eventually go to the Communists."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Mar. 11, 1968]

WAR AND POLITICS

Either at Hue or at Khe Sanh, some sort of all-out Communist offensive is expected soon. How we meet it may make a big difference in the conduct of the war (on both sides) thereafter.

In a sense, Khe Sanh has become a symbol, and a mighty important one. President Johnson recently made every one of the Joint Chiefs of Staff say in writing that Khe Sanh could be defended successfully. He has let it be known in strong language that he doesn't want another Dien Bien Phu.

A senior U.S. military spokesman said last week: "I don't rule out Khe Sanh, but my impression is that (the enemy) has more interest in Hue than Khe Sanh at this time." Whether Hue or Khe Sanh is hit, however, won't alter the meaning of North Vietnamese General Giap's intention—which is to launch a Tong Cong Kich (a General Offensive).

General Giap, according to a Washington Report of the American Security Council, isn't a classical general like Westmoreland or Navarre. He's a Marxist; and, "for a Marxist," says Giap himself, "strategy is, above all, politics."

Giap is said to believe that domestic and international pressures on Washington are building inexorably in favor of North Vietnam; that inasmuch as the 1954 attack against Dien Bien Phu was launched the day after North Vietnam had been assured that negotiations could start, the attack against Khe Sanh (or Hue) can begin at the first signs of a weakening on President Johnson's part.

French General Henri Navarre says solemnly: "Today, Giap has the initiative and the situation has to be judged in relation to his intentions. To take Khe Sanh, he would have to use 40,000 men and (be prepared to) lose half of them. But, if he does that, and the psychological effect is to make the Americans give up quickly, he will have won."

Giap believes in protracted warfare; some of his superiors do not. In any case, the Vietnam war has already been protracted over two decades. Boys on both sides who weren't even born when it began are fighting in it now.

In so many ways, it isn't a military war at all: It's a political war. Ho Chi Minh and General Giap and President Johnson know this. The only ones who don't know it are the U.S. servicemen, and large segments of the American public.

Khe Sanh is called a "symbol." Battles are fought for "effect."

The whole sorry mess stinks of blood, while our brave GIs at Hue and Khe Sanh wait patiently for the inevitable attack.

Whatever happens, we say this has been one cheap and humiliating way to fight a war.

The sooner politicians stop their fusillade of words and let the military win the war, the better. True, as James Burnham has written in the current *National Review*, the Vietnam war may take on a different look after November 5, but it is a sad reflection on our nation's leadership that such a comment could be made.

The Portuguese Provinces Angola and Mozambique

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the noted author and columnist, James Jackson Kilpatrick, has prepared a special study on Angola and Mozambique which I think will be of great interest to our fellow colleagues.

I include Mr. Kilpatrick's study following my remarks:

THE PORTUGUESE PROVINCES: A PLACE FOR PIONEERS

(By James Jackson Kilpatrick)

It is the most commonplace of observations—every American visitor is struck by the same impression—to remark that southern Africa is peculiarly "pioneer country." Whatever the thought may lack in novelty, it makes up in striking truth. The traveler who attempts to learn something of Rhodesia and South Africa finds his sense of the Great West confirmed and strengthened by a follow-up visit to Angola and to Mozambique. This is the good and inviting land; it is the hard and perilous land as well.

Doubtless the pioneer parallels ought not to be pushed too far. The Ovimbundu, Bakongo and Kimbundu of Angola, for one thing, are not only more numerous than the Apaches, Comanches and Sioux of General Custer's day; they also occupy a completely different position politically. Portugal's object is not to make war upon the Chokwe and Cuanhama; Portugal's object is to get them into school. In Mozambique, the busy, bustling cities of Lourenco Marques and Beira have reached a level of commerce and industry that is relatively more advanced than Kansas City and San Francisco in the days of the opening of the American West.

Allowing for all this, the pioneer impression persists. To fly in a small plane over Angola and Mozambique is to recapture an impression of Wyoming and Utah as they must have looked more than a century ago. Beyond the cities, the limitless land unrolls, vast, empty, waiting. The lumbering prairie schooners of Kansas have yielded to lorries, Jeeps, Land Rovers, Piper Cubs. The isolated rancher or miner is not wholly isolated; he is linked by radio to the twentieth century world outside. New power lines, ungainly as giraffes, march in single file across the hills. But when the sun goes down, the bush is Bible-black. Only the animals move. So the American mesa country must have been, when men traveled by horse toward unknown horizons. The Portuguese provinces are waking from the sleep of centuries. Economically they have passed a threshold point; looking ahead, they see the opening door.

Angola lies upon the west coast of southern Africa, a land of 481,000 square miles, twice the size of Texas. A recent estimate places the population at 5,200,000, of whom 250,000 or about 5 per cent, are of European extraction. The Africans are almost entirely Bantu in origin; they are divided into nine tribal groupings and four principal dialects.

Angola's history dates from its discovery in 1482 by the Portuguese explorer Diego Cao. The land then was loosely ruled by the King of the Congo. His authority soon passed to Portuguese hands, and except for a few years in the mid-seventeenth century, when Dutch invaders took control, Portugal has exercised effective sovereignty over Angola ever since.

The fact has contemporary significance. With so long a history behind them, the Portuguese reject the notion that they are Johnnies-come-lately in Africa. They cannot accept the view of the United Nations General Assembly that Angola is a mere "colony" of the European metropole. On the contrary, the Portuguese look upon the African provinces as integral parts of the Portuguese whole. American visitors are reminded repeatedly by their hosts of the analogy of Hawaii and Alaska, equally remote from the mainland American Union. In the years before the two territories achieved statehood, one is asked, would the United States have tolerated international intervention in their domestic administration? Surely we would have objected. By the same reasoning, it is urged, Portugal will continue to maintain her position that problems of the African provinces are entirely her own domestic affairs, and hence beyond the authority of the United Nations.

Portugal's case is strengthened by the very nature of the multi-racial, or non-racial society that has developed in the two provinces. Unlike South Africa and Rhodesia, Portugal shuns racial classification of every sort. Tribal governments hold no official status in Angola and are recognized only for political courtesy in Mozambique. Voting is by a single roll. The expanding system of public education is completely integrated. Persons of African descent face no racial impediments in property ownership or in labor. Angola's legislative council is composed of 34 members; about one-third of them are Africans. With every year that passes, the number of Africans in the civil service increases. The Secretary of Education is an African; so is the director of customs. Almost half of all public employees, including the police, are African or mulatto. Finally, it is said, through generations of interracial marriage, blood lines have become so intermingled that a single proper noun suffices: The people of Angola are simply "Portuguese."

The objective observer must be forgiven a few reservations. It is apparent, especially in small towns and rural areas, that a sharp line of demarcation separates the indigenous black from the indigenous or immigrant European. Relatively speaking, only a handful of blacks occupy positions at the managerial level in government or commerce. As a matter of law, segregation does not exist; socially and economically, it is a palpable fact of life in Angola.

To be sure, segregation is a palpable fact of life in Westchester County as well; and there is this to be said of the Portuguese promise to achieve a genuinely non-racial society in the African provinces, that a prodigious effort is being made to pull the Africans up. Over the past three years, enrollment in Angola's largely African technical schools has jumped from 7,700 to 11,600. In the province as a whole, roughly 66 per cent of all school-age children are now in school. Angola's Governor General Camillo de Miranda Rebocho Vaz is not satisfied with the figure; his administration is seeking earnestly to expand the enrollment of African pupils, but the obstacles are immense.

The greatest of the problems is rooted in the low population densities of the rural areas. In many remote parts of Angola, a hundred square miles will not turn up a hundred children of school age. Roads in such areas are little more than trails. The prevailing tongue is a tribal dialect. How are these children to be brought together for classes? Where are teachers to be found? The typical rural African family, subsisting in a mud hut, has had little motivation for learning in the past. Under the circumstances, it is perhaps greatly to Portugal's credit that even two-thirds of the children are receiving some education.

By general agreement, the next two decades should witness swift advancement for the

African people of Angola. A number of considerations support this optimistic view.

Political forces plainly will continue to push the Portuguese government in the direction of internal reforms. "Independence" is the talismanic word; the U.N.'s General Assembly demands it unceasingly; neighboring Zambia and the Congo have it. Portugal is determined not to grant independence in either Angola or Mozambique, but the Salazar government sensibly, if belatedly, recognizes that if bloody revolution is to be avoided, the African majority must be able to see a satisfactory way of life in continued Portuguese affiliation.

Ironically, the several terrorist organizations, mistakenly described as "nationalist" groups, now appear to have aided Portuguese efforts to maintain the provincial status. Disturbances in Angola began in 1959 and came to an appalling climax in 1961 with the butchery of Europeans along 300 miles of Congolese border. But the terrorists did not kill Europeans only. In the savage rekindling of ancient tribal animosities, thousands of Angola's blacks suffered also. A backlash process set in. Prior to 1961, a considerable sentiment for independence existed among blacks and whites alike; today, one is told, that sentiment has sharply diminished. The protective presence of Portuguese troops appears vastly preferable to the violent raids of Holden Roberto's guerrillas. And as one unexpected dividend, the recurring threat of terrorist attacks has prompted many isolated African compounds to resettle in safer, larger communities where public education now becomes a feasible possibility.

In the winter of 1967-68, the terrorist organizations, suffering themselves from internal dissension, appeared to be under reasonable control. The principal group, the Union of the Populations of Angola (UPA), is thought to command a following within Angola of not more than 10,000. Under Roberto's leadership, the organization continues to operate from headquarters in Kinshasa. Opposed to the UPA is the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA), headquartered in Brazzaville, led by Dr. Angostinho Neto. The MPLA guerrillas, raiding largely from Zambia, are excellently armed and trained by Russian and Cuban resources. They have created local disturbances in southeast Angola, in the general area of Luso and Catombo, and have harassed the Benguelan railway, but authorities in Luanda believe the raids can be contained.

To counter the terrorist attacks, Portugal maintains some 45,000 to 50,000 troops in the field, augmented by up to 2,000 militia. A Selective Service system is in full operation. By the end of 1967, approximately 20,000 Angolan men, without regard to race, had been drafted for three-year enlistment periods. Some 750 Portuguese troops have been killed in action in Angola, but most of them died in the 1961 fighting. Militarily, the outlook is good.

Economic forces also are playing an encouraging role in Angola's future. In 1968, two additional 75,000-kilowatt generators will be installed at the massive Cambambe power plant on the Cuanza River southeast of Luanda. Built in 1962 at a cost of \$43 million, the hydroelectric installation is the pride of Angola. As demand for power increases, the dam will be raised; other dams will be built upstream; the prospect is for an abundant power supply over the foreseeable future. At the end of 1967, negotiations were underway for both a steel mill and an aluminum processing plant.

In an effort to attract foreign capital, Angola offers a number of incentives, including a program of tax exemption for periods of five to ten years. Technical education of a labor force is expanding rapidly, though it is freely admitted that skilled labor is in short supply. The generally low income level of the African people serves to restrict the

domestic consumer market, but this situation is improving. Wage rates start at a government-fixed minimum of 17½ escudos per day (about 55 cents); major employers also must provide housing, clothing, medical care, recreational facilities, and other benefits. This system of benevolent corporate paternalism, under strict government control, appears to work well.

Angola's principle need, as described by the Governor General, is for a massive inflow of capital and technical skill. "We could take thousands upon thousands of technically trained people," he says. "We are getting only hundreds and hundreds." The country is rich in copper, manganese, phosphates, tungsten, titanium, and diamonds; the discovery of oil in northern Cabinda in 1966, now under development by Gulf, has created boom conditions there. A housing market of significant proportions is in prospect. Angola is the third largest producer of coffee in the world. Emigrant farmers and livestock growers are offered title to up to 60,000 acres of land after three to five years of successful production.

Modern-day pioneers who may wish to tackle Angola will find life in the back country hard but endurable, and potentially rewarding. The capital city of Luanda will remind American visitors of Charleston and Savannah—arches, verandas, columns; houses of pale green, rose, beige, bright blue; native women, standing straight as 6 o'clock, with baskets on their heads; luxury apartments only a few blocks from thatch-and-mud native slums. Air service is complicated by political embargos over most of Africa, but good jet schedules link Luanda with Lisbon, Johannesburg, Salisbury and Beira. Costs of living are moderately high. English is spoken as a nearly universal second language. Crime is almost unknown.

Many of the foregoing observations apply with equal effect to Mozambique, on Africa's southeastern coast, though Mozambique is larger in population (7,000,000) and smaller in area (303,000 square miles) than her sister province of Angola. The principal cities of Lourenço Marques and Beira are more sophisticated than Luanda and Benguela; the pace of urban living is faster; the second language often is French; and Mozambique culturally looks more to the Middle East and East than to the West.

One senses in Mozambique, moreover, a wider range of both problems and opportunities than one finds in Angola. Here everything is more intense.

Relatively speaking, the European (white) community in Mozambique is quite small, numbering no more than 145,000 in all—about two per cent of the total. The great bulk of the population is composed of African tribal groups of Bantu stock—the Tsonga and Changones in the south, the Sena and Manica in the center, the Macuas across the north, the savage Makondes along the Tanzanian border, and the Nyanja in the Lake Nyassa area bordering Malawi. Each of the major tribes has retained its own dialect and basic tribal organization. In the south, a process of native assimilation moves forward steadily; here the South African gold mines offer a source of contract employment, and the industries of Lourenço Marques exert a modernizing influence. In the north, the situation is quite different. In the vast area beyond Nampula, between the Lurio and Lugenda rivers, civilization advances slowly. This is wild and rugged country. Along the coast, from Lumbo to Nacala and Porto Amelia, the shallow opal waters give back the azure sky. Mountains rise abruptly from the coastal plain, rocky archipelagos in a sea of brown and green. Here and there, cotton plantations attract a force of native labor. Few Western visitors penetrate into Cabo Delgado. Its resources await another day.

For a variety of reasons—years of indifference by Portuguese rulers, absence of in-

dustrial capital, disunity among the sharply separated tribes, difficulties in communication—the social and economic development of Mozambique has proceeded slowly. Estimates vary on the number of children now receiving schooling. At the end of 1967, the figure reportedly was in the neighborhood of 600,000, but the figure is deceptive. Education is compulsory only through the fourth year, and the compulsion is difficult to enforce. Fewer than 12 per cent of the children go past this primary schooling, and most of these are children of European extraction. An estimated 600—one out of a thousand—go on to higher education.

The situation is not wholly bleak. Each year sees a substantial jump in the percentage of African pupils going on to industrial, commercial and liberal arts training. More than a hundred trade schools came into existence between 1960 and 1966; the new lycées that one visits in Beira and Lourenço Marques are attractively designed and apparently well administered, but they are sorely in need of library and laboratory facilities. A new university in the capital offers limited opportunities in higher education. Medical instruction is available, but the medical school attracts lamentably few African students. An interesting experiment in education by radio, intended for isolated communities throughout the province, is supplemented by mobile teaching "brigades" whose object is to raise the social and cultural levels of the bush. Plainly, much remains to be done.

Economic development within Mozambique compares generally with conditions in Angola. The province needs capital; it needs skilled technicians; it offers strong incentives for Western managers and administrators possessed of the pioneer spirit. Mozambique's mineral resources, chiefly gold, bauxite, and tantalite, scarcely have been touched. Textile manufacturing and food processing offer attractive opportunities. Mozambique does well in cotton production; since 1966, the province has processed its own large output of cashew nuts; and though cattle raising is handicapped by the untamed tsetse fly, the area south of the Limpopo holds a rich potential for livestock. Tourism is increasing in importance as an economic factor. At Gorongosa, Mozambique maintains one of the most spectacular game preserves in the world; two thousand miles of shore line offer hundreds of secluded and beautiful beaches.

Most of Mozambique's industrial economy revolves around the port cities of Lourenço Marques and Beira. Their development has been handicapped politically, by the United Nations' sanctions upon Rhodesia and by the general disfavor manifested within the world community toward Portugal's policies in Africa. Beira has suffered severely under the British blockade against Rhodesian commerce. A new oil pipeline, connecting Beira and Salisbury, is kept in chains under dramatic lock and key. The port of Lourenço Marques has been less affected; its gross commerce rose from 7.6 million tons in 1964 to an estimated 11.5 million tons in 1967, as new trade with Swaziland and South Africa replaced losses in Rhodesian business. For a city of barely 200,000 population, Lourenço Marques boasts remarkably modern port facilities, especially for bulk cargoes of sugar, chrome, manganese, copper and iron. Settlement of the Rhodesian problem would benefit Mozambique immensely; the province reckons its direct loss, as a consequence of the sanctions, at nearly \$50 million in port traffic and rail freight through 1967. With a typical Portuguese combination of hope, pessimism and wry humor, Portugal has sent the United Nations a deadpan bill in this amount. There is no foreseeable prospect of the U.N.'s paying up.

Problems of internal security continue to trouble the province, but early in 1968 these appeared to be more of a costly and dangerous nuisance than a serious threat to Mozambique's survival within the Portu-

guese arrangement. Two insurgent organizations are active, but again, it is a mistake to think of them as "nationalists" or "liberation forces" or "freedom fighters." The tribal blacks of Mozambique, by and large, have no more identification with a prospective "nation of Mozambique" than the blacks of Angola have a national identification with their western province. The ostensible purpose of the insurgent leaders is to "establish democracy." This is sham. Their first object is power; their second is booty.

The larger of the two groups is the Mozambique Liberation Front, known as FRELIMO, headed by Western-educated Eduardo Mondlane. For the past several years, the organization has been headquartered in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, where Dr. Mondlane is living with no apparent discomfort in a palatial villa. A veteran fellow-traveler, the onetime instructor at Syracuse University reportedly is drawing support from both Peking and Moscow. In the autumn of 1967, Portuguese forces captured one of the FRELIMO bands. They found automatic rifles, machine guns and mortars provided by China, and explosive provided by Russia. By every indication, FRELIMO operates with the complete support of the Tanzanian government, which provides trucks for the terrorists and assists them in operating training camps along the 500-mile border. For manpower, Mondlane relies chiefly upon Makonde warriors, who traditionally have made life miserable for their tribal neighbors. The Makondes, who played a leading role in the Zanzibar revolution, are described as fierce fighters, rough and hardy, but inclined to internal quarrels. Not all of them are willing to stick with Lazaro Kavandame, their "operational commander." A loose alliance between the Makondes and the less warlike Nyanjas seemed to be weakening toward the end of 1967.

Mondlane publicly has claimed domination over some 800,000 persons living in the Niassa and Cabo Delgado districts. The claim is disputed by Portuguese authorities in Mozambique, who say the Makonde terrorists control only a few communities in the northern tip of the Mueda plateau. The Portuguese estimate FRELIMO strength at 3,500 guerrillas inside Mozambique, plus another 2,500 in training in Tanzania. It is a force of sufficient size to tie down a large number of Portuguese troops (the number is classified), but Portuguese commanders say the situation is contained. They are pressing a campaign to win support from the tiny villages that freckle the high plateau; companies of local militia are being recruited with some success. At the end of 1967, some 400 villages were thought to be "loyal, secure, and pro-Portugal" with the contested area.

A smaller terrorist organization, the Mozambique Revolutionary Committee (COREMO), operates out of headquarters in Lusaka, Zambia, with the manifest sanction of Zambia's President Kenneth D. Kuanda. Little is known of COREMO; it was established in 1965, and relies for its principal support upon the Chinese Communists. Toward the end of 1967, its activities appeared to be slowly increasing.

Remnants also exist of still a third rebel outfit, the Mozambique African National Union (MANU), which was formed in 1961 by a group of Makonde exiles in Kenya under the leadership of Matthew Michinjiri Mmale. From 1962 until 1964, MANU was merged with Mondlane's FRELIMO; then the merger broke up in a spate of accusations that Mondlane was an "American stooge." Still other splinter groups acknowledge the leadership of David Mabunda, Marcelinos dos Santos, the Rev. Uriah Simango, and a white physician, Dr. Elder Martins. The combinations of rebel affiliations, it is said, shift with the political winds. As 1968, began, none of the winds seemed likely to blow up an immediate gale. The Organization of African Unity, despite some huffing and puffing in October of 1967,

appeared to be declining as an effective and influential force. Meanwhile, Malawi's nonsense president, Dr. H. K. Banda, was emerging as a major force for peace in central Africa. Great hope was held that his friendly pragmatism might yet produce a tolerable pattern of co-existence for all of Africa south of Tanzania and the Congo.

The recurring guerrilla raids along the distant borders arouse little concern in the major cities of both Angola and Mozambique. The residents are too busy adjusting to the swift changes that urbanization—and the U.N.'s persistent pressure—have brought upon them. In both provinces, high-rise buildings are springing up. An increasing percentage of the African people abandon native dress in favor of Western clothing. At every hand, one notices the spread of American products—Pepsi, Seven-Up, Coca-Cola, Orange Crush; Shell, Mobil, Gulf. In the newsstands, a comic book leads the young Portuguese-African down the dime novel trail: *Batman Solve o Crime Perfeito!* One flies in a Piper Comanche over some of the most primitive land on earth, and the plane radio brings "Alexander's Ragtime Band." Commercial wrestling has come to Luanda. Dr. Fu Manchu plays in the outdoor cinema. Bookstalls offer Truman Capote, John O'Hara, Ian Fleming. The streets are thick with traffic. The airport at Beira is as jammed as LaGuardia at shuttle time. Only the pervasive presence of Portuguese troops, handsome young devils in dark berets, suggests that anything might be amiss. At the outskirts of the principal cities, car-checks go on by night and day; and far beyond the cities, in the plains, the hills, the high plateaus, in jungle and in desert, the tribal life persists. Barely half a mile out of Luanda, by a busy four-lane highway, a monkey sits in a baobab tree, and blinks his eyes as the Mercedes roll by.

Back in Lisbon, the problems of the emerging provinces increasingly occupy the attention of Portugal's aging premier Antonio Salazar. During the course of an exclusive interview at Estoril, Dr. Salazar strongly defended Portugal's policies, past and present, in the gradual development of the African provinces. One question was intended to elicit a progress report on growth of the "multi-racial" concept.

"The question leaves me under the impression that it is believed the aim of achieving a multi-racial society was defined only a short time ago, and has only now commenced to be put into effect in Angola and Mozambique. This view, if it exists, is not correct. As defined by the Constitution, the Portuguese nation has for a long time considered itself, and is, in fact, multi-racial. Out of the discovery of new lands came the successive aggregation of a national whole. Whether the inhabitants, where there were any, were black or red or yellow was not of the essence. The essential was that the native populations were considered equal in status with the European subjects of Portugal. So that Angola and Mozambique and Guinea were part of the Kingdom of Portugal, and not colonies in the nineteenth century sense, held by sovereign power for economic purposes. That being the case, the advancement of the population proceeds in the provinces as it does here, the only differences being those which may result from individual capabilities and the local economies."

Dr. Salazar was asked about U.N. pressure upon Portugal. He responded with a sweeping criticism of those whom he described as "believers in instant civilization."

"It is a fact," he said, "that the United Nations is exerting pressure upon us in respect to the political evolution to be promoted in Angola and Mozambique. And it is not only the Africans of color and origin who exert this pressure; it is the Asians; and it is the Westerners, bound to conceptions of their own history, who have difficulty in un-

derstanding that we did not participate with them in the division of Africa into colonial territories, for which reason we are not obligated to follow their example.

"Western Europe, tired as a result of World War II, and finding it impossible to resist pressure exerted upon her, successively granted independence to the African territories under her sovereignty. This she should not have done—first, because there were no 'nations' constituted there which could be turned into independent states; and second, because the majority of them lacked the economic resources on which to form an administration of their own. No heed was paid to the fact that there had not yet been formed a political, administrative and economic elite, capable of managing the collective interest of which, incidentally, in most cases not the slightest awareness existed.

"Without European sovereignty, without the financial means, without the whites who ran the administration and opened and managed undertakings, stability and progress could not have been maintained. This should have been foreseen; but it was not; and with few exceptions, the so-called independent states of Africa have retrogressed.

"The idea has gained currency that the civilization of a people can be achieved through a process of development to which a definite and short period of time can be fixed. This false notion forms the basis of the misconception of those powers whose experience should have warned them against committing such a great error. The idea that an aggregation of sometimes hostile tribes can be converted into a duly structured nation, simply by spending large sums of money, is also partly responsible for the situation.

"For all these reasons, we of Portugal remain indifferent to the attacks of the United Nations, unleashed by Africans or by Westerners. We would remain indifferent to them even were the Portuguese situation, from the sociological or political viewpoint, identical in Africa to the position of the colonial powers. And I began by showing that it is not."

It is possible to credit Dr. Salazar's sincerity absolutely, and still to make the point that Portugal has not been wholly "indifferent" to the pressures of outside opinion. Both terrorist raids and U.N. resolutions manifestly have had an effect upon Portugal's relationship with her African provinces. More than four and a half centuries have passed since the Portuguese explorers and missionaries planted flag and cross in Africa. For the most part, these were years of the slave trade, of primitive existence, of colonial administration, of political apathy, of economic and social indifference.

Now comes a time of renaissance for Portugal's provinces—a time of protected labor, minimum wages, compulsory schooling, low-cost housing, medical benefits, new roads and hospitals and power plants. It is still Bible-black by night in Gorongosa, and the night has yet a time to run, but in Portugal's policy of accelerated gradualism a pale and hopeful light now rims the African sky.

A Nuclear Navy

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the March 3 issue of the State newspaper, of Columbia, S.C., contains an editorial entitled "A Nuclear Navy." It is an excellent summary of the long struggle that the more defense-minded Members of Congress have had with the present ad-

ministration to construct nuclear-powered ships for the U.S. Navy. The editor cites the many advantages for a crew in a nuclear-powered vessel, and also documents the advances made by the Soviets in this area.

While the war in Vietnam must be foremost in all present thinking, we must keep in mind that the modernization of the Navy through nuclear propulsion is one of the best investments in our future security that we can make.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NUCLEAR NAVY

Underway in Washington are hearings that could be a decisive round in the long battle over a nuclear-powered Navy.

South Carolina's L. Mendel Rivers, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, has timed this investigation perfectly as Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara leaves office.

McNamara and his cost-effectiveness ideas drastically slowed the development of a consequential force of nuclear-powered surface ships. He has consistently contended that such ships are too costly and that their obvious advantages over conventionally powered ships are not sufficient to justify the extra cost.

As a result, the U.S. Navy has only four nuclear surface ships—the carrier Enterprise, the cruiser Long Beach and two frigates. These four ships have sailed 11 million miles without reactor trouble requiring the cancellation of a mission. In addition, the Navy has 75 nuclear submarines, which, with the Polaris and Poseidon missiles, are a major part of our nuclear deterrent.

These ships are able to stay at sea for months and require only infrequent port stops. A naval vessel in port is a sitting duck; at sea it is a mighty weapon.

Congress has appropriated funds for additional nuclear surface ships but only one carrier, the Chester W. Nimitz, is under construction. (It will cost \$544 million, twice as much as if it were conventionally powered.)

Rivers and McNamara have had many head-on collisions; this running battle ranks with the best of them. The Armed Services Committee's report on the 1968 bill said: "If the reluctance of the Secretary to accept nuclear propulsion is not overcome shortly, the prime question before the Congress will become: 'Can the appointed Secretary of Defense thwart the exercise of the constitutional powers of the Congress to provide and maintain a Navy?'"

Actually McNamara has relented somewhat and has asked for two more nuclear carriers and two more nuclear escort ships. But his penny-pinching has put the program behind.

All of this haggling has come at a time when Russia has been building up its naval strength dramatically. It still has a way to go to surpass the mighty American fleet in total strength but it is gaining fast.

In just 10 years it built a modern force of 19 cruisers, 170 destroyers, missile frigates and escorts and 560 motor torpedo boats. It also has 360 subs (55 nuclear), compared with 155 for the U.S. But it has almost no attack carriers and only two helicopter carriers.

The Soviet Union also employs its vast merchant and fishing fleets and its numerous oceanographic ships for naval purposes.

Russia is seeking supply ports in various parts of the world and its Navy is flexing its muscles in the Mediterranean, the Pacific and other areas.

This Russian activity is ominous and bodes trouble in the future. America cannot afford to permit its Navy to flounder and fall be-

hind. Our world commitments are growing, not getting smaller.

All of this adds importance and urgency to the Armed Services Committee hearings. They should provide valuable information for new Defense Secretary Clark Clifford.

Although the war in Vietnam must be foremost in his mind and planning, the modernization of the American Navy through nuclear propulsion must be given high priority. There are places in the Defense Department and the government to save money, but this is not one of them.

Tenth Congressional District Questionnaire

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1968, I mailed approximately 93,500 IBM card questionnaires to registered voters of the 10th Congressional District of Virginia. Since most addressing plates combined the names of all voters in each family, the questionnaire covered about 167,000 people.

I have now received 23,685 completed returns, representing 24.3 percent of those mailed. I believe all my colleagues will agree that this is a truly amazing response. In addition, thousands of letters have come from constituents with additional comments on the questions asked.

Sending questionnaires is one of the many procedures I have followed through 16 years here in the House, in my continuing effort to know the views of the citizens of northern Virginia concerning the many problems with which our Nation is confronted. The responses not only help me better represent those I serve in Congress, but also give the voters an opportunity to think the problems through for themselves and finally reduce their varied opinions, as we in Congress must, to a "yes" or "no" vote.

The results of my 1968 voter family questionnaire, as of March 9, 1968, are as follows:

[Results in percent]

1. Do you approve of the President's conduct of the Vietnam War?

Yes	32.3
No	63.8
No response	3.9

2. In North Vietnam, do you favor—
Intensified U.S. air attacks..... 64.9
A bombing halt..... 15.8
Maintaining air attacks at present level..... 13.4
No response..... 5.9

3. Should the United States continue to trade with nations that are aiding North Vietnam?

Yes	20.2
No	76.7
No response	3.1

4. Do you believe the American people are receiving sufficient information from the Government on vital foreign and domestic issues to allow them to vote intelligently?

Yes	25.1
No	72.2
No response	2.7

5. Do you support the administration's proposed increase in taxes?

Yes 36.1
No 61.8
No response 2.1

6. Do you believe that Federal spending on domestic programs should be reduced?

Yes 66.3
No 31.5
No response 2.3

7. Should industries which install equipment to reduce air and water pollution be granted tax credits by the Federal Government to offset part of the expense involved?

Yes 60.5
No 36.9
No response 2.6

8. Do you favor returning a percentage of the tax money collected by the Federal Government to State and local governments to be used as they see fit?

Yes 57.1
No 40.0
No opinion 2.9

9. Do you favor abolishing the electoral college system and allowing voters to cast their ballots for the President and Vice President?

Yes 81.2
No 16.3
No response 2.5

10. Do you favor a local bond issue or tax increase to extend subway connections in your suburb?

Yes 53.1
No 43.0
No response 3.9

11. In dealing with civil disorder, do you favor—

Stricter handling of rioters and "demonstrators" by police and the courts? 79.9
More programs for improvement of slum areas? 17.6
No response 2.5

12. Do you favor compulsory integration of housing and apartments in your neighborhood?

Yes 16.0
No 82.4
No response 1.6

The 49th Anniversary of the Order of DeMolay

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, today is the 49th anniversary of the founding of the Order of DeMolay by the late Frank S. Land of Kansas City.

Earlier this year it was my pleasure to contact the Post Office Department to recommend that a commemorative stamp be issued in 1969 honoring "Dad" Land, and it is my sincere hope that such a stamp will be issued.

Perhaps the most marvelous phenomenon in our Nation today is our young people. This modern generation is more educated, informed, and motivated than any generation this Nation has ever produced. They are constantly searching and probing for the truth, establishing their own social values of right and

wrong, and are quick to develop their own sense of justice.

In their haste, and because they are young, they often become disillusioned or turn to other than lawful means to correct what they consider to be injustice. Therefore, it is imperative that these young people receive as much guidance as possible during this period of their lives.

There are many youth organizations that provide our young people with healthy activities, but there is one in particular that is known for its character building among the young men of the Nation. That is the Order of DeMolay. It is fitting that a special tribute of recognition be paid to this organization at this time, for this week the Order of DeMolay is celebrating its 49th anniversary.

It was 49 years ago, on March 18, 1919, that 28-year-old Frank S. Land, a man who had no son, gathered nine teenage boys around him in his office in Kansas City, Mo., and discussed the founding of a new organization for young men—an organization that would allow them to enjoy the fun and fellowship of a fraternal group advised and counseled by adults who were the Masonic leaders of the community.

The organization was named for Jacques DeMolay, the last Grand Master of the Knights Templars, who was burned at the stake by King Phillip of France on March 18, 1314, as a martyr to loyalty and toleration.

Today, members of DeMolay strive to carry on the fine ideals for which DeMolay gave his life—loyalty and service to God and fellow men.

DeMolay membership is open to any boy of good character who is between the ages of 14 and 21. Although DeMolay chapters are sponsored only by Masonic bodies or individual Masons, it is not necessary that a boy be a son or a relative of a Mason to belong to DeMolay.

Today, there are over 2,500 active DeMolay chapters throughout the free world and nearly 3 million young men have become DeMolays since the founding of the organization.

The youth movement is governed by an International Supreme Council composed of over 200 outstanding Masons located around the world. They meet in annual session to review the progress of the Order.

DeMolay's slogan is "Building Better Citizens." Its ritual is what sets the organization apart from other youth groups.

The ritual was written in 1919 by Frank Marshall, a prominent Mason and newspaper man in Kansas City. It has been termed ageless, and is divided into the Initiatory and DeMolay Degrees.

The Initiatory Degree is one of solemnity and consecration, during which the initiate dedicates himself to uphold the precepts of respect for parents, reverence, courtesy, comradeship, fidelity, cleanness, and patriotism.

The DeMolay Degree is a dramatic and historic portrayal of the trials, tortures, and martyrdom of Jacques DeMolay, and teaches a lesson in fidelity and comradeship.

As the officers of a chapter, young men are taught responsibility and given the opportunity to express themselves before

a group of fellow youths. The members run their own meetings, plan their own programs and carry them out. Through this practical application of having to assume the responsibilities of running a chapter, the young men become strong leaders and better citizens.

Although DeMolay ritual and meetings are greatly reverent, the organization does not advocate any particular creed, but teaches only a profound faith in the one living and true God.

Awards are given to individuals for achievement. Merit medals are awarded for distinction in civic service, athletics, music, dramatics, religion, and other fields. Special keys are given for obtaining so many new members. The Degree of Chevalier is the highest honor an active DeMolay can receive. It is earned by outstanding service to a chapter and to fellow DeMolays.

The greatest honor in DeMolay is the Legion of Honor. This is conferred on Senior DeMolays, over 25, for outstanding service to their community and their fellow men.

International and jurisdictional membership, ritual, efficiency, and athletic competitions are held for the chapters. Each chapter is encouraged to have a balanced program of social activities. Social events, like all other DeMolay activities, are attended by an adult adviser of the chapter.

Chapters and individual DeMolays are also required to observe certain obligatory days annually. These include Devotional Day, Patriots Day, DeMolay Day of Comfort, Educational Day, Parents Day, Frank S. Land Memorial Day, and My Government Day.

The participation of DeMolay chapters in community projects has been extensive and is sometimes carried out on an international basis. Teenage traffic safety programs have been especially successful. These involve campaigns aimed at making safe drivers of all young people. Such efforts have received high praise from the National Safety Council and local law enforcement agencies.

Other projects that have been carried on include charitable fund drives, blood donations, civil defense, anti-narcotics, and distribution of safe-driving pledges.

Recently DeMolay marathons in sports fund raising and civic service activities have captured the headlines of many community newspapers. Marathons have proven to be an important part of many chapters' activities program.

Each chapter is supervised in all of its functions by an adult advisory council. One man is designated as the official "Chapter Dad" to handle the supervision of chapter meetings and to counsel the members.

Another helping hand for most chapters is the Mothers' Club. These now number over 1,900. The Mothers Clubs primarily help the members raise money for their activities, and they usually handle the purchase of and repair chapter regalia.

DeMolay does not attempt to take the place of the home or church, but rather supplement them. The organization's purpose is to offer the young men of

today: first, a wholesome occupation for his spare time; second, worthwhile associates; third, the best of environment; and fourth, an interesting and complete program of all-around youth development.

Truly it is doing an outstanding service for our country by taking the youth of today and helping them to become more responsible citizens for tomorrow.

Houston Supports Our Servicemen in Vietnam

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, in these days of "sit-ins" and like demonstrations protesting our role in Vietnam, little press coverage is given to those who actively support our fighting men and our cause in Vietnam. I want to sight as an example one such instance in my district which was reported in a few lines only in the press.

Last November, the employees of the Veterans' Administration Regional Office in Houston initiated a project to send gifts to the brothers and sons of their coworkers serving in Vietnam. They contacted one of the regional office employees, who was then serving his second tour of voluntary duty in the VA's Vietnam Contact Office, for suggestions on what to send. He sent the information, together with a request to broaden the project to include as many men as possible in the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment and the 39th Infantry Division.

The enthusiasm with which the employees responded was overwhelming. They seemed to feel it was a personal thing between them and our fighting men in Vietnam. Their gifts ranged from socks to razors to tinned sardines. There were over 300 pounds collected in all. A letter from the employees to the servicemen said simply:

All of us want all of you to know that we are very proud of the job you are doing in Vietnam. We are looking forward to the day when we can serve you men when you return to civilian life.

A report I have received from Mr. Percy J. Mims, manager of the Veterans Administration Houston Regional Office, indicates that many heartening responses have been received from the servicemen. He cited one in particular which read in part:

Your concern for the welfare and comfort of the men in our Armed Forces is greatly appreciated and is certainly a tremendous boost to their morale. This is indicative of the kind of spirit that has kept and will continue to keep our country strong and free.

I would like to commend both Percy Mims and the employees of the Veterans' Administration Regional Office for this splendid project. Such demonstrations of support are glowing evidence of the fundamental soundness and strength of the great majority of the citizens of our country.

Riverton, Wyo., Newspaper Comments on the Draft

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, a central question facing a teenager about to leave high school and enter college—or something else—is when will he be drafted and under what conditions.

The student editors of the Riverton, Wyo., high school have taken a look at the draft and the war which necessitates it at the current high level and concluded:

The blood and the death of any war will seem distant to those who have no personal contact with it. But as seen by the death of former Riverton student Gary Foster, it can be a part of all who undertake a responsibility of growing up.

The editorial appears in the March 8 *Le Voyageur*, the Riverton High School newspaper published in conjunction with the Riverton Ranger, the city's daily newspaper owned and edited by Roy and Bob Peck.

The student journalists reflect without rancor in the specter of the draft and the increasing commitment of Vietnam. They observe that "with this in mind the aspect of college takes on a different look." And indeed it does.

Mr. Speaker, I include that the thoughtful and well-written editorial from *Le Voyageur* in the RECORD.

EDITORIALLY SPEAKING

In less than a year the hundred and one senior boys of the class of '68 will probably be involved in one of the biggest decisions they have faced in their lives. Because of the recent shake-ups in the draft, disbanding both graduate student deferments and essential job deferments, the new Secretary of Defense, Clark Clifford, will be under pressure from military leaders in the U.S. to issue a draft call in the early part of this summer to reach the nineteen year old students.

The effect of the proposed new draft call would utilize the nineteen year olds at a rate unequalled since World War II. The present system calls for 41,000 men in March of this year, with the number increasing to 48,000 in April which includes the call up of 4,000 Marines, again for the first time since World War II. With the continued increase in quotas, the new system on graduate and otherwise nonessential jobs supposedly fills the call, but the military wants younger men than the 25-27 bracket of the above. The logical step would be a call up for the nineteen year old "men". If a new draft order were issued it would probably affect six former students of RHS a month. Six of the present senior class would go, starting in the first part of 1969, unless they were doing satisfactory work in college.

With this in mind the aspect of college takes on a different look. Students who weren't doing the required work would be under increasing demand at the draft board, and the military would be looking for the non-college student with even greater intensity.

The war in Vietnam, whether right or wrong is growing at a rate of 10,000 troops every two months, and the military life is not an anticipated part on too many seniors life, but it is a real part. In all probability, most of the seniors at RHS will have to make the choice of college, working, or volunteer-ing.

The war then, is soon to be a very real part in the lives of the seniors at RHS. The blood and the death of any war will seem distant to those who have no personal contact with it. But as seen by the death of former Riverton student Gary Foster, it can be a part of all who undertake a responsibility of growing up.

Support for Our Armed Forces in Vietnam

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the mothers of the Nation have a vested interest in our present conflict in Vietnam because it is their sons who are fighting the battle there for freedom. But, it is also the mothers of this Nation that know what freedom means when raising a child and assuring his future. I have received a number of letters from mothers across the country, who though they decry that the war is necessary, have given their patriotic support to this Nation and its endeavor in Vietnam.

Mrs. Evelyn LeSaicherre, of Gonzalez, La., writes:

I am writing you in behalf of the Gonzalez Memorial Ladies Auxiliary to the VFW. . . . I wish to say that we do support the position of the U.S. Government in the Vietnam war. Of course the parents and loved ones who have boys or relatives fighting are not overwhelmed because there is such a war, but they do realize that this war being fought may as well be saving our country. In such events you can never tell what could happen to our great United States.

Mrs. Elsie Long, president of the Comer Jones Auxiliary, VFW, Luray, Va., writes:

We would like it known to you and your committee that we are in full support of our United States Government's decision in the Vietnam war. We would like the full support, by every means available, given to our fighting men, so that this war can soon close victoriously and our men return to their homes and families. This letter comes from a membership of 45 VFW Auxiliary wives, mothers, sisters, and grandmothers of Veterans who are most concerned about the attitudes of the elected representatives in Washington who seem to be weakening in their efforts toward Vietnam. May they strengthen their efforts by knowing we are all behind them.

Mrs. Marth E. Dyke, department president of the Ladies Auxiliary of Ohio writes:

As a member of the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of Ohio, I am writing to let you know I support the position of the United States Government in Vietnam.

A similar letter comes from Grace Schafer, in Santa Barbara, Calif.:

I wish you to know that I support the heads of our government in their policies and their efforts to win the war in Vietnam.

Mrs. Marguerite Bruce of North Hollywood, Calif., writes:

My husband and I stand behind our government in its decisions and commitments. I am against dissenters, draft card burners, peaceniks and draftdodgers. President Johnson has our full support. God bless him."

**A Letter of Rebuttal to Senator
Robert F. Kennedy**

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1968, the Honorable ROBERT F. KENNEDY made a speech in Chicago, in which he gave his assessment of the Vietnam situation.

A friend and constituent of mine, Mr. John K. McLean, has provided me with a copy of a rather lengthy letter he wrote to Senator KENNEDY in which he rebutted many of the Senator's comments on Vietnam.

In an effort to provide Mr. McLean with the widest possible forum from which to present his rebuttal, I insert the entire text of his letter at this point in the RECORD:

ALEXANDRIA, VA.

HON. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I have just read the excerpts of your Chicago speech of February 8th published in the New York Times. I would like to make a few comments on your deeply pessimistic view of the situation in Vietnam, which I find unsupported by factual argument.

1. You state that the Viet Cong attacks on the cities have demonstrated that no part or person of South Vietnam is secure from their attacks. This is unfortunately true, and it will continue to be true until these vicious gangsters, who think nothing of committing mass murder on innocent people who want nothing more than to be left in peace, are taught that the line has been drawn and their depredations will not be tolerated. If the line is not drawn and this Oriental Mafia is rewarded by being handed the reins of power in Vietnam, as you suggest, not only can we expect to see a tremendous blood bath, as they liquidate all their past and potential opposition, but we can expect their imitators in other countries to increase the audacity of their operations. Thus there will be many countries, perhaps including even the United States itself, of which you will be able to say that no person is safe from the depredations of these unprincipled but highly disciplined mobsters. We have already seen in Newark and Detroit what can be done by relatively unplanned and unorganized guerrilla activity in our own cities. Imagine what can be accomplished if the admirers of the Viet Cong ever start operating here in the same way they operate in Vietnam!

2. You find it incredible that as many as 20,000 out of an attacking force could have been killed. You base this on the assumption that the number of wounded must have been double the number killed. In one of the battles I participated in in the Pacific in World War II the enemy force numbered about 23,000 and as I recall no more than 1,800 survived the battle. I find nothing incredible about a ratio of fatalities such as that claimed in the attack on the cities in Vietnam. The attackers were essentially suicide squads, and since they have been defeated, it is not surprising that they suffered a high ratio of fatalities.

3. You state that we are suffering from the illusion that we can win a war which the South Vietnamese cannot win for themselves. Having been involved in the Pacific campaigns in World War II, I find this reasoning very strange. It is like saying that it was hopeless for us to try to liberate the Philippines because that was something the

Filipinos had to do for themselves. The fact is that we liberated the Philippines—and a great deal more territory besides—without any substantial amount of assistance from the inhabitants of much of that territory. The same kind of defeatist talk was heard at times during the Korean War, especially when our forces were pinned down within the Pusan perimeter. You may recall that there was considerable talk at that time of giving up and withdrawing from Korea. General MacArthur was, in fact, given that option by President Truman. He wisely chose to persevere and seek a victory. No doubt we have seen our share of military reverses in Vietnam, but American and South Vietnamese forces have also achieved some notable victories. Who can outlast whom? Would you have counseled surrender in World War II, when the British suffered defeat after defeat at Dunkirk, Dieppe, the North African desert, Crete, Singapore?

4. You state that you cannot expect people to risk their lives and endure hardship unless they have a stake in their own society. You say, "They must have a clear sense of identification with their own government, a belief they are participating in a cause worth fighting for." You imply that the South Vietnamese are not so motivated.

I am not familiar with the empirical evidence on which you base your basic premise. I noted in a recent issue of the New York Times an account of three young Viet Cong found dead manacled to their machine gun. It would appear that their masters expected them to endure hardship and death, but they seemed to have had some doubts that these young boys would do all that was expected of them unless they were chained down. One would think that an army that used such inhuman tactics would not command much loyalty from the men in the ranks and that they would all desert at the first opportunity. Since that does not seem to be the case, is it possible that there is more to the morale and psychology of the fighting man than a sense of identification with his own government?

The fact is that throughout history men have fought bravely and to the death for governments in which they had no stake and causes in which they had no particular interest. What stake did the men who made up the army of Henry V have in the outcome of the battle of Agincourt? I don't know whether Henry made a speech like the one Shakespeare puts in his mouth, but certainly Shakespeare's words give a pretty good idea of one of the key elements in military psychology. The cause worth fighting for was the cause the King thought worth fighting for. The King appealed to their sense of honor, their craving to be a part of a glorious struggle, knowing that whether they lived or died, succeeded or failed, their fellow countrymen and their descendants would do them honor. I think you are being excessively intellectual when you assume that every soldier is also a political scientist who carefully weighs the strong and weak points of his own government as he decides how much effort he will put into the battle. During World War II, I interviewed quite a few Japanese prisoners. I don't recall ever meeting one who gave up because he realized that Japan was an authoritarian state that did not merit his allegiance and that things would be better if Japan were defeated by the benevolent and humanitarian Americans. The Japanese morale was amazingly high even when they were going down to defeat. We discovered that one reason they tried to avoid being taken prisoner was that they had been thoroughly indoctrinated with the notion that we would torture them. This suggests that high morale may depend not so much on the belief that your own government is great and good as on the belief that the enemy is infinitely worse. Perhaps the VC do a better job of inculcating fear and hatred than do the South Vietnamese. I understand that

prisoner interrogations frequently confirm that the VC soldiers have been taught to believe that surrender would mean torture and death.

5. You suggest that the recent attacks on the cities revealed that we have an ally in name only. I read in the papers that our Vietnamese allies performed extremely well in these attacks. Certainly the Hanoi propaganda that was broadcast in the early days of the attack suggest that they thought there were going to be mass defections of ARVN troops. I understand that not as much as a platoon defected. Why then denigrate the performance of these men?

6. You say that it is an illusion to think that a military victory is in the interest of either us or the Vietnamese. You say it is the people of Vietnam who are the greatest losers in this continuing battle. However, you do not say what their loss will be if they lose the battle and are subjected to the gangster rule of Ho Chi Minh. You speak of the plight of the refugees in South Vietnam and compare their number to 25 million Americans. What about the million refugees who fled from Ho Chi Minh's terror and found safety in the South? How many people would have to flee the South if the gangsters were to take over there—2 million, 5 million? Where would they go? What about picturing 20 million Americans seeking desperately to flee the U.S. to safety in Canada or Mexico, carrying with them nothing but the clothes on their backs? That is an even more heartrending thought than the idea of 25 million being temporarily displaced from their homes. The people of Vietnam will indeed be the losers if their country is turned over to the gangsters after so much blood has been spilled to stave off that takeover. I find it encouraging that despite the incessant propaganda, despite the prospect that the U.S. will lose heart and not persevere, despite the war-weariness, the citizens of South Vietnam have shown in the early days of February that they are not willing to rally around the Viet Cong and give up the battle.

7. You say that it is an illusion to think that our interests and the interest of Southeast Asia are related to the outcome of the struggle in South Vietnam. You have erected your own strawman in saying that this is because we expect to build a Great Society in Southeast Asia. I don't think those of us who are familiar with Asia have any illusions on that score. Our objective is very simple, and it is the same objective we had in World War II in both Europe and Asia. We want to show the aggressor that we mean to draw the line beyond which he cannot step with impunity. We think it is better to draw it in Vietnam than in Thailand, Indonesia or the Philippines, just as we think it would have been better to have drawn it at the Rhineland instead of at the Polish Corridor in prewar Europe.

8. Finally you see no prospect that we can wear away our enemy in Vietnam or destroy his will to fight. Lloyd Mallan recently interviewed a dozen top military figures in the U.S., all retired and free to speak their minds. He found that all thought that the United States could accomplish what you think is impossible. Moreover, they thought that it would take a maximum of six months. These generals and admirals may all be wrong and you may be right, but somehow the judgment of the military generals commands a little more respect than the judgment of an ex-attorney general.

It appears to me that you see our enemy in Vietnam rather differently than do some of us. You condemn the killing by General Loan of a Viet Cong terrorist, but nowhere in your remarks, as printed in the Times, do you express the least horror or resentment of the hundreds and thousands of executions perpetrated by the Viet Cong in their recent attacks on the cities. Have you no tears to shed for the children of the mur-

dered parents, the parents of the murdered children, for the American missionaries brutally massacred, for any of the human beings whose lives were needlessly snuffed out of deliberate acts of terror? How can you suggest that the men who direct this kind of "political" activity deserve to be dealt with across the negotiating table with the object of giving them the power of life and death over the entire population of South Vietnam? You are a man of great compassion, but where is your compassion for the hapless people of South Vietnam who have no desire to see the prison wall that now surrounds the northern part of their country extended all the way to the southern coast? Where is your compassion for the people of Thailand and Laos, who will have the terrorists knocking at their doors with greater frequency once the success of the tactics is proven in Vietnam and the Americans have shown themselves to be faithless allies and paper tigers?

If that were to happen, we would truly be a country without allies, and we would deserve none.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN K. McLEAN.

A POW Returns

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in January it was my privilege to be guest of the city of Wurzburg, West Germany, and its oberburgermeister, Dr. Helmuth Zimmerer.

It was just 23 years ago today—March 18—that some 50 kriegsgefangene, U.S. soldiers captured in the Battle of the Bulge, crouched in fear in the basement of an old stone house in Wurzburg. I was one of those prisoners.

Overhead, wave after wave of British bombers roared, dropping their payloads of firebombs and butterfly bombs on the beleaguered city, making the earth tremble with each devastating blast.

Wurzburg, which is located on the Main River, is a true gingerbread city as seen from its port by morning. But it was 85 percent destroyed. More than one out of every five of its 100,000 citizens were dead. The city had been delivered a crushing blow 50 days before the end of the war.

War is aptly described as hell on earth to the participants. But to me and the other prisoners of war there—slave laborers to the National Socialists of the Hitler crowd—it was a demoralizing living death. Yet, while marching to work, being on the forced job and moving about the old city, history could not be denied—even to a prisoner of war.

Surviving the bombing was the majestic old Marienburg Castle, which stood high on the hill above the populated valley and the river. Seventeenth-century homes and the church spires of many cathedrals dotted the hillside.

Through the years, since my escape in early 1945 from that Nazi POW camp, I wondered what had happened to Wurzburg. Did it ever recover from that heavy bombing and high loss of life?

Upon my return there back in January, I found a city that had been rebuilt—clearing away almost all the scars of one

of the most terrific bombing raids during the war.

Most of the reminders of those terrible days of World War II were gone—like a destroyed page of the past.

Still standing in all its majesty, as a silent witness to history, was Marienburg Castle, and the morning view from the port allowed me once again to look upon the gingerbread houses.

And happily for me, the occasion was a much different one from those bleak days 23 years ago.

Msgr. Francis P. Kowalczyk and His People

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Msgr. Francis P. Kowalczyk the people of the congressional district which I represent have lost an outstanding and dedicated servant of God, and his parishioners have lost a warm and loving pastor. I might add that Monsignor Kowalczyk was a friend of mine and I mourn him personally.

I insert an article from the Herald-News, of Passaic-Clifton, N.J., of March 12, 1968, which was written by Lester Plosia and captures very well the essence of this great man:

MSGR. KOWALCZYK AND HIS PEOPLE: HE INSPIRED IMMIGRANTS AND THEIR PROGENY AT HOLY ROSARY

PASSAIC.—The big ruddy priest sat quietly unruffled by minor earthly quarrel.

It was a Thursday afternoon after 71 years in Passaic, presiding at a meeting whose members were trying to breathe new life into an old city.

There was some fuss about red tape involved in the downtown urban renewal project. The hearty man in black listened, withholding comment, hoping his friends would find a common path.

Something in the discord touched a deep well of mirth in the priest. He glanced down the bare table at the reporter, slouched in a chair next to a window overlooking Broadway.

CHEERFUL IN SPIRIT

The oceanic sense of humanity a priest finds raising a generation of immigrants and their children burst forth. His eyes creased, humor welled into his face. He winked—a divine mischievous wink—the wink of a young boy growing up on the Eastside who, having seen it all, remains cheerful in spirit.

It was Msgr. Francis P. Kowalczyk's last afternoon on earth, a blink of an eyelash before his time. He was to die getting ready for Mass in his beloved Holy Rosary parish next to the river the next morning.

His death came Friday about the time his personal alarm clock, Holy Rosary's morning bells, tolled across the tenements and flats of lower Dundee and echoed across the Passaic River into Garfield. Ringing over their chapel for the last time, the bells punctuated a chapter in Passaic's Eastside which began those days in the late 1890s when they built the Wall Street Bridge, a time when Msgr. Kowalczyk was born.

BOYHOOD ON EASTSIDE

Raised on Fourth Street, his life walked a ghostly path next to the Polish immigrant factory workers whose children and grand-

children are now spread out into suburbs of south and southwest Bergen, Clifton and upper Passaic County.

His people were the Eastern Europeans who huddled in the tenements and two-family homes around Pulaski Park, trodding to the textile, rubber and paper mills on the nearby river before dawn broke each day. Speaking their language, he came out of St. Joseph's parish school, rooted even deeper among these people. He found his niche at Holy Rosary, the new church by the river, from the day he took his holy orders.

ERECTED YOUTH CENTER

Opposite the church and rectory on Wall Street stands a white brick parish youth center, built in 1962 under Msgr. Kowalczyk's leadership. It represents the capstone of two-score years on the Eastside.

"A poor family's son could become a priest then, too," recalls a neighbor from the old days. He pauses, recalling a little thought in his own mother's heart, a thought, that he might choose the cloth like the Kowalczyk boy next door. "Father Kowalczyk was a fine man."

It was a life spent in the streets of the poor, making calls, furnishing spiritual solace through hard times, building a better people. Over 1,500 of them called to pay respects over the weekend. They were still coming in yesterday and were there for his funeral at 10:30 this morning.

American-Flag Air Carriers

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I am very concerned with the imbalance caused in our international travel account by U.S. residents traveling aboard foreign-flag ships and planes much more often than overseas residents travel to the United States on American carriers.

Between July 1966 and June 1967 for instance, gross transportation revenue earned by foreign-flag carriers from U.S. residents exceeded that earned by U.S. carriers from visitors to the United States by \$588 million—more than the \$500 million President Johnson is seeking to cut from the Nation's travel deficit.

Obviously our balance-of-payments situation could be vastly improved if more American residents used U.S.-flag air carriers and ships.

Recently I joined my distinguished colleague, Mr. GARMATZ, in introducing a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that every effort should be made to encourage American industry and the American public to ship and travel on American ships. This resolution was supported by all members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee as well as many other Members in the House. American-flag air carriers were not included because the Merchant Marine Committee has no jurisdiction in that area. However, I call on the House to amend this resolution, at the proper time, to include U.S.-flag air carriers.

I sincerely hope the committee will act at an early date to report this important resolution. We must act now.

Freedom's Challenge

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, at the Veterans of Foreign Wars annual Washington dinner on March 12, Donald S. Elfenbein, a junior at the John Harris High School at Harrisburg, Pa., gave his prize-winning speech in "The Voice of Democracy" contest. Young Mr. Elfenbein's superb composition and his masterful delivery on the theme "Freedom's Challenge" won him the respect of his mature and admiring audience. Several Members of Congress have called me following his excellent presentation and asked whether they could have a copy of this stirring address. The prize-winning speech is herewith recorded:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE (By Donald Elfenbein)

A crowd of eager young people stand on a dock waiting to board the barge which will carry them across the wide river. The barge is the Ship of Life, and the river is the Stream of Time. In his story, "The Other Side of the River," Somerset Maugham describes all the baggage stacked on the dock, which their elders insist they take with them. But only the young have tickets, and only they can decide what baggage, what values, what ideas they want to carry into the future. Were I waiting on that dock, I would choose to take my freedom as an American with me on the Ship of Life. And I know that if someday I am to place freedom on the dock for my children to take, then I must guard it well—and I know that to prepare myself to guard my freedom, I must now take with me a strong and sincere love of freedom.

We in America, enjoying the blessings of freedom must also face the dangers which threaten our heritage. We cannot permit a tyrannical foe to engulf democracy and violently destroy the rights we hold sacred. Nor can we, in unconcern, permit our freedom to be gradually diminished from within. Grave threats have confronted Americans since the Declaration of Independence; they will confront us tomorrow. But by meeting a single challenge today, we can prepare to meet the dangers, and to assure the survival of liberty. This single challenge is for each American, and especially each young American, to treasure, to cherish, and to prize his freedom above all.

Because we Americans are accustomed to so much, we may value it too little. Freedom is all we have ever known, and we accept it as we accept the air we breathe. When watching a civil rights demonstration, do we reflect on our freedom to assemble? When wondering whether to join Dad's clothing business or help lift the poor out of the slums, do we consider that the choice is ours? Even swinging open the door of our church or closing the voting booth curtain behind us, do we ever pause to appreciate our heritage? But we must pause, and we must reflect . . . I perhaps as I face the motionless folds of our flag in silent meditation at the start of each school day . . . you perhaps now, at this very moment.

Let us all take a quiet moment to imagine

life if a weekend trip to New York were forbidden, or the reading of *Mein Kampf* illegal, or an irate letter to our congressman impossible. And we must pause now. The realization that we are indeed fortunate to be free will be too late if it comes after our freedom is lost.

As a freedom-loving young American, what can I do, still standing on the dock, still unable to defend my freedom? If now I truly prize my freedom, then I am strengthening it by defending the front line of indifference. But the love of liberty that I have today will cross the river with me and will drive me to guard my liberty tomorrow, in the voting booth and on the battlefield.

If then I truly prize my freedom, then eagerly will I cast my ballot, knowing my obligation to the preservation of freedom. If then I truly prize my freedom, then willingly will I serve in time of crisis, knowing my duty to the defense of freedom.

George Washington saw no need to caution his countrymen, who first fought and died to win freedom and then forged a system to preserve it, because "the love of liberty," in his words, "was interwoven with every ligament of (their) hearts." Is this love of liberty interwoven with every ligament of our hearts today? If it is not, then we must look fearfully to the future and prepare to see our freedom slowly chipped away, if not suddenly shattered—unless we can accept freedom's challenge and meet it. The generations of Americans before mine, who fought for freedom in Birmingham and in Normandy have laid the love of freedom on the dock; now we must take it with us. Only after I and every young American realize that our liberty cannot survive unless we cherish it—only then will our liberty survive.

At the dinner, I sat at a table between his father, Mr. Conrad Elfenbein, and the boy's high school principal, Mr. Paul Porter, and they were both visibly moved by the outstanding performance of this young man. Not only Harrisburg, but also the whole State of Pennsylvania and the whole Nation is proud of this remarkable composition and eloquent delivery. We congratulate Donald Elfenbein for his outstanding contribution at a time in our history when some such justifiable patriotism is warranted.

Fino Introduces Bill To Give Veterans 6-Percent Home Loans Regardless of Regular Mortgage Interest Rate

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to establish a program which will assure our Nation's veterans of mortgage loans at a rate of interest not in excess of 6 percent.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, will authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans to veterans purchasing homes in metropolitan areas when the Administrator determines that private capital is not generally available. At present, such loans can only be made in rural areas, small cities, and towns. The interest rate on such direct loans, as provided for by my bill, would not exceed 6 percent. I would like to emphasize that the Federal loan would be made only where private financing is not available at 6 percent.

I am mindful that some people will say that we cannot afford this program in such a tight budget year, but I would like to point to other and far more expensive programs which are being newly proposed this year. In the 1968 housing bill, for example, the President has proposed a program whereby the poor would be encouraged to seek homeownership by subsidies which would reduce their mortgage interest rate to 1 percent. Clearly, if we can reduce these rates to 1 percent, we certainly can afford to make sure that our deserving veterans are able to obtain loans at 6 percent.

The Stalled Anticrime Bill

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the San Bernardino Sun pointed out in a recent editorial that, despite the national concern over crime, Congress has failed to act on a major anticrime bill: the proposed Safe Streets and Crime Control Act.

The bill is one that should not be allowed to die, the Sun declared, observing that every day of delay increases the cost we pay for crime.

I endorse the Sun's comments and include the editorial in its entirety:

[From the San Bernardino (Calif.) Sun, February 20, 1968]

THAT STALLED ANTICRIME BILL

Despite all the public concern over crime, Congress has not implemented any part of the major federal program proposed by the President's Crime Commission one year ago.

The commission was a blue-ribbon panel which undertook a searching examination of crime, submitting a 340-page study which included more than 200 specific recommendations for action at the federal, state and local levels.

The report has had considerable impact across the nation, even though Congress has been slow to act. Prof. James Vorenberg of Harvard Law School, who was executive director of the commission, says that in travels around the nation he found the report extensively used by police departments and by the 25 states which have set up planning committees to outline major anticrime programs.

The Government Printing Office said that as of Feb. 2, a total of 193,190 copies of the report had been sold with heavy buying orders still arriving daily. That total is in addition to the 40,000 copies the commission gave away to police departments, the press and other interested persons.

The commission's key recommendation, calling for substantial federal aid to local police departments, is embodied in an administration bill now stalled in the Senate. The bill passed the House last August, but has since been bogged down in the Senate Judiciary Committee, where members are wrangling over wiretapping and the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

The bill is one that should not be allowed to die. The need to update the quality of scientific equipment for the police, the need for better trained and better qualified police personnel is imperative.

Every day that the Senate delays boosts the amount that the nation pays for crime. The senators should get on with the job.

Free Market for Domestic Gold Industry

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the Second Congressional District which gave the State of California its nickname of the "Golden State," I am tremendously pleased by the action taken by the gold pool nations and our own Treasury Department this weekend, for I believe that it rights a wrong which has been enforced for more than three decades.

This action achieves a goal for which I have worked since I first came to Congress more than 9 years ago, for it establishes a free market for the domestic gold industry of this Nation. It does this by separating gold used for monetary purposes from that which is consumed by industry, science, commerce, arts, and crafts.

As a result of this weekend's action, effective immediately the U.S. Treasury will no longer sell its gold stock reserves to commercial sources for these purposes. Instead, commercial and industrial users of gold will purchase this commodity from gold refineries at whatever price the commercial market will bear.

This is a tremendous step forward as far as the Nation is concerned for two reasons: First of all, domestic commercial users withdrew from the Treasury last year \$158,000,000 worth of gold which, of course, contributed to the downward trend of the Treasury gold reserves. Second, the action to separate monetary gold from that used by industry and commerce, in effect establishes a free market for domestic gold being used for commercial purposes. This will be of tremendous value to the gold mining industry of our Nation for it places it on the same footing that all other minerals—and I might say all other commodities—have been on for years.

The old policy of tying the price of gold used for industry, commerce, science, and arts, to the arbitrarily established monetary figure of \$35 an ounce, strangled our domestic gold industry, for this industry could not in any way hope to survive when shackled with prices which were established in the depths of the depression 30-some years ago.

None of us, I am certain, would want to try to exist today on incomes which had been fixed since the late 1930's. This is what the Federal Government has been asking the gold industry to do. This gross injustice I have been fighting for many years. And this is what I believe is corrected as a result of the action taken this weekend to let industrial and commercial gold sales seek their own dollar level on the free and open market.

The importance of this to the State of California and the Second Congressional District is readily shown, for gold is California's best known metallic mineral commodity. Since 1848 the State has been the source of more than 106 million fine ounces valued at more than \$2.4 billion, at the prices in effect when the gold was mined, making it the most productive

State in the Nation. Even at the present price of \$35 per ounce, the total output would be valued at more than \$3.7 billion. Gold mining was a major industry in the State for nearly a century. In 1940, California's gold mines yielded more than \$50 million and employed nearly 14,000 men. In 1965 the output was only \$2,170,000, and the industry employed less than 100 men. Although world gold production has reached annual alltime highs in recent years, U.S. production, especially that of California, has diminished greatly. This diminishing trend is attributable mainly to greatly increased costs coupled with a fixed price of \$35 per ounce established by the U.S. Treasury in 1934.

It, of course, is impossible at this point to estimate the economic impact of the establishment of a free market for industrial and commercial gold because no one can foresee the price levels that the gold will reach when operating in a free trade. However, I feel that the actions which we consider here today are momentous because they remove from this industry the chains of arbitrary, unrealistic Government regulations. The gold mining industry now has the opportunity for the first time in many, many years to stand on its own two feet.

Those Who Would Have Us Get Out of Vietnam Are Thinking Only of Today

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1968, there appeared in the Boston Herald-Traveler an article written by the very learned and distinguished Rabbi Joseph S. Shubow of Temple B'nai Moshe in Boston, Mass. Rabbi Shubow's letter to the editor is timely and of great importance to all who desire to understand the real meaning of our involvement in Vietnam.

I am pleased to commend Rabbi Shubow's article to the Members of the House:

THOSE WHO WOULD HAVE US GET OUT OF VIETNAM ARE THINKING ONLY OF TODAY

For several years the U.S. government and the American people have been gradually drawn deeper and deeper into the quicksands of a mortal struggle with a ruthless, godless, fanatical foe in Vietnam which has indeed taken a heavy toll of our own gallant heroes.

It is very easy now for the post eventum wisecracks among us to shout: "I told you so, we should never have been there in the first place." Apparently these gentlemen, including distinguished and learned professors of economics, of political science and of the law, are eager to counsel President Johnson to get out and as speedily as possible, because the going is very tough and because the enemy repudiates all honest efforts at peace, and because we have no reason to be there in the first place.

These advisers apparently think only of today; they have no regard for the morrow; they refuse to realize why America has chosen to be in Southeast Asia and to risk life, limb and vast fortunes in a sincere effort to contain Communism.

Some suggest that we should have left the Asiatics to their own devices, for in the long

run communism would rot and all its followers would corrode with it and would eventually come begging for help, food and protection from the Western world. There may be a modicum of truth in this approach. Our generation might have been spared for a few years the ominous days of an inevitable future.

But when the next generation or the next decade would inevitably be confronted by a fanatical horde of oriental Communists to whom life is cheap, human values non-existent, the moral law without validity, faith in a God of Justice and Righteousness a mere fantasy and conspiracy, as the Communists have preached and written, when such a time might come for a final showdown as to whom belongs the earth, the West might be much weaker, more fretful and because of self-indulgence, possibly deprived of the necessary strength of character, faith in our own civilization and in our own love of country, so that life a self-indulgent Carthage, we might readily collapse before a mighty Rome.

It is horrifying and incredible to hear the illustrious Prof. Galbraith pronounce in advance the death of the South Vietnamese army "within a few weeks," the disappearance of the South Vietnamese government and the flight into the jungle and into the woods of a vast majority of the South Vietnamese population in order to join the Vietcong. I hazard to state that the very reverse is happening and will happen; even the lukewarm South Vietnamese have had a real taste of the ferocity and fury that they can expect from the Vietcong.

We will and we must inevitably triumph against the Communist conspirators whose bidding the North Vietnamese are now doing and we will overcome those elements in American life that give aid and comfort to a mortal enemy that seeks to destroy President Johnson and to demoralize our people. I can foresee a great inevitable victory for the Marines and the G.I.'s if only we stand by them and do not snipe at them from the rear and do not stab them in the back.

I prefer to follow the advice of Prof. I. Milton Sacks, a specialist in Vietnam matters, because he has an abiding sympathy for President Johnson and his administration and is thoroughly opposed to those who seek to embarrass the President, to ridicule our government, to shake our faith in the Pentagon and in the gifted generals who help the President guide his policy. He predicts correctly that there is no other course of action possible for America and its allies but to finish the task to which it has put its hand with honor, with grace, with readiness for self-sacrifice and thus avert the inevitable greater calamity that may face the world in our nuclear age.

Prof. Galbraith suggests we stop the bombing; this is ludicrous for we saw what happened when hostilities were halted to help usher in the Year of the Monkey. Prof. Galbraith suggests "the most dignified exit possible." We thank God he does not suggest a cowardly retreat and immediate flight from our sworn responsibility. There is only one way, the way of honor, courage, zeal—yes fanaticism—and faith in the ideals of freedom and democracy to save Vietnam and the freedom of the world.

The "Pueblo"—How Long, Mr. President?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 56th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

Needed: Counsel for the Victims

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Barron's Weekly for March 4 carries a most informative and enlightening article on the use of taxpayers' funds to handcuff society from controlling the criminal element.

Looks like the simplest answer to safe streets and crime control is not more taxes but merely to cut off the OEO crime subsidies.

I include the Barron's article by Shirley Scheibla as follows:

COUNSEL FOR THE OFFENSE: OEO'S LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM UNDERMINES LAW AND ORDER

(By Shirley Scheibla)

"We either make the law and the legal system work fairly for poor people—and make them believe it does—or our cities will be burned down from the fires ignited by a 'brooding sense of injustice.'" (Earl Johnson, Jr., Director, Legal Services Program, Office of Economic Opportunity.)

WASHINGTON.—In suits financed by the War on Poverty, lawyers for the "poor" have sought to persuade U.S. district courts in Newark and Philadelphia to appoint federal receivers to run the local police departments as a means of eliminating "police brutality."

The Philadelphia suit also asked the court to nullify state laws against carrying concealed deadly weapons, sedition, riot, conspiracy, loitering and obstructing justice. The Newark case further calls for the court to direct the Newark police to cease engaging in "violence, intimidation and humiliation" and to stop compiling dossiers on civil rights groups.

FBI DIRECTOR OPPOSES

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover views the legal moves as part of a scheme to undermine and destroy local law enforcement and to substitute a national police force. "America," he declares, "has no place for, nor does it need, a national police force. . . . Law-abiding citizens and local officials should vigorously oppose concerted attacks against law enforcement and the devious moves to negate local authority and replace it with federal police power."

The cases are just two of a good many highly questionable moves that have been made under the Legal Services Program of the Office of Economic Opportunity. In virtually every riot-torn city, LSP lawyers have devoted an extraordinary amount of time and money to defending alleged rioters. Evidence obtained by Congressional investigators indicates that the director of Newark's LSP played a leading role in that city's riot last summer which resulted in 25 persons killed, 725 injured and property damage estimated at \$10 million. (The Newark LSP says it "is a pioneer program.")

LSP personnel also have advocated non-cooperation with police, organized rent strikes, defended alleged dope addicts and challenged statutes aimed at discouraging immorality. With federal funds, they have launched a flood of suits against various government agencies, including the Department of Labor and local public housing authorities. And they are successfully using the courts to establish new welfare law which stresses the recipients' "rights." In addition, they have been accused of violating legal ethics and handling cases on behalf of those who could afford to retain their own counsel.

CIVIL CASES

Nowhere is the program mentioned in the Economic Opportunity Act, or in any other

law. OEO, however, sees LSP as a legitimate function of community action programs which the Act does authorize.

The program at first won proponents with the idea that it would protect the poor against unscrupulous merchants, finance companies and slumlords. Public defenders and legal aid societies, said OEO officials, are chiefly concerned with criminal cases involving the poor as defendants. LSP, so the argument went, would give the poor the chance to initiate civil cases to redress legitimate grievances. Thus they would come to view the law as friend rather than enemy, and more of them would become law-abiding.

Through such arguments the LSP won endorsement by the American Bar Association and U.S. Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas, as well as many other distinguished judges and lawyers. With scant opposition, LSP was able to launch operations on a wide scale. Today some 1,800 lawyers, and numerous assistants, operate out of 850 offices in 48 states. No fees are charged; salaries for all are paid by OEO. It spent \$27 million on LSP in fiscal '67 and has budgeted \$36 million for this fiscal year (and \$42 million for next year).

As the program swings into action on a wide scale, however, the original intent has begun to change. Earl Johnson, Jr., LSP director for OEO, states flatly, "The primary goal of the War on Poverty's Legal Service Program should be law reform achieved by significant test cases that can revise the structure of the world in which the poor live."

TAIL-GATING CABBY

In Newark, the program seems to have changed the city's structure. Here is the story of LSP work in that city, which so far has cost the U.S. \$700,000. According to a staff report of the House Education and Labor Committee, last July 12 a cab driver named John William Smith was tailgating a police car and then passed it on the wrong side. When stopped, he responded with loud and obscene language. When he resisted arrest, police used force to subdue him.

Within an hour after Mr. Smith's arrest, a large crowd gathered outside the police station. According to OEO, Oliver Lofton, director of the Newark LSP, tried to persuade the crowd to turn its energies toward demonstrating peacefully at City Hall. However, both Newark Police Director Dominick Spina and Donald Malafronte, administrative assistant to Newark Mayor Hugh Addonizio, told House Committee investigators that Mr. Lofton harangued the crowd for 45 minutes on police brutality. Moments after his speech ended, the riots began. A Molotov cocktail landed on the police building, and the crowd threw stones and bottles at police cars.

Leonard Kowalewski, a Newark policeman and head of the New Jersey Fraternal Order of Policemen, gave details on Mr. Lofton's plans to move the demonstration to City Hall. Mr. Kowalewski testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee that within an hour after the cab driver's arrest 75 cabs lined up in the vicinity of the Fourth Precinct police station to carry people downtown. "Now I fail to understand," Mr. Kowalewski testified, "how you can get 75 taxicabs lined up within one hour if something or other wasn't pre-arranged."

"DESIGN AND PLAN"

Edward G. D'Allesandro, counsel to the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, Local No. 3, subsequently wrote the Essex County prosecutor that the organization of the demonstration so soon after the arrest of the cab driver gives "prima facie evidence of a design and plan."

While the Newark riots still raged, Washington's Evening Star quoted Mr. Lofton as saying they were caused by "racist, brutal white cops and a mayor who refused to work with poor, helpless, frustrated people." He added, according to the Star, that the riots

"will be a solidifying factor for the Negro community." (At last report, the LSP was seeking signatures to a petition to remove the mayor from office.)

Several days after the Newark disaster, Mr. Lofton declared on television: "I don't look upon the antisocial behavior as a riot. . . . We are now reaping the poison harvest of 300 years of history, and what we really see here is the voice of the people revolting against an unjust system. . . . If somebody doesn't get together and bring some pressure to bear upon that City Hall, we're going to have riot after riot in this city."

Apparently ignoring the idea that the LSP was supposed to give free legal help to the poor primarily in civil cases, Mr. Lofton immediately offered its services to Mr. Smith, the cab driver. The latter accepted the offer and filed charges against the arresting policemen for kidnapping, filing a false police report, atrocious assault and battery and attempt to commit murder with a deadly weapon.

Mr. D'Alessandro noted, "The case of the cab driver is a criminal one, and the Public Defender would be the proper agency to represent indigents, if in fact John William Smith is indigent."

OEO AWARD

As for Mr. Lofton, the governor of New Jersey appointed him to a special commission to investigate the Newark riots (which ran into a storm of criticism when it reported they were not organized). OEO gave the Newark LSP a special award for outstanding performance of duty. Distinction is nothing new for Mr. Lofton; in 1961 and 1962 he served as legal assistant to Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, then U.S. Deputy Attorney General.

In an investigation of the role of the LSP in the Newark riots, the Committee on Law and Poverty of the New Jersey Bar Association found that, "The entire resources of the Newark LSP and the Public Defender of the state of New Jersey and Mr. Howard H. Kestlin, (New Jersey) director of legal services of the OEO, were thereafter marshaled to provide legal services for those persons who had been arrested in the course of the Newark riots." (At OEO headquarters Information Officer Edward O'Hara is not sure whether this included the defense of Newark anti-poverty worker Charles McGray and Black Arts Theater playwright LeRoi Jones, who were arrested in Newark for firing rifles from a car in the middle of the riot.)

LSP lawyers have defended alleged rioters on an even greater scale. Earl Johnson, Jr., director of LSP for OEO, told the American Bar Association last August: "Soon over a score of Legal Services attorneys from all over New Jersey were busily engaged in representing arrestees. Similarly, in Detroit, a team of Legal Services lawyers and volunteers from the bar labored mightily to provide representation to the thousands of persons arrested in that city's riots. And the experience has been repeated in almost every city where riots have broken out."

BAIL FUND

In response to charges that the LSP raised bail for persons arrested in connection with the riots, the committee said private contributors set up a special trust fund to furnish bail. It explained: "For convenience, the specially contributed funds were deposited in a Newark LSP bank account for the Newark LSP but were treated separately from the project's own funds. We have been unable to uncover any evidence substantiating the charge that funds originating from the federal government were used to provide bail." The committee did not question the propriety of having the LSP administer such funds.

The committee also failed to question the distribution of leaflets in Newark by the LSP jointly with the American Civil Liberties Union, although New Jersey Deputy Attorney General Joseph Hoffman called them (ac-

cording to The New York Times) "irresponsible, legally unethical and what might well constitute incitement to riot." The leaflets urged all witnesses of police brutality to contact either the LSP or the ACLU.

The committee did note that the Newark LSP received, reviewed and analyzed 247 statements and affidavits dealing with charges of police brutality. "Even if all of them were without merit, it was necessary that they be received and processed . . . It was the obligation of the Newark LSP to receive and process these complaints, just as it was the duty of the police to preserve law and order," the committee declared.

Any evidence gathered in this way presumably will be used in the suit to turn the Newark police department over to a federal receiver. The suit was filed jointly by the LSP and the ACLU. According to The Washington Post, Arthur A. Kinoy is a chief adviser in the case.

DISRUPTS HEARINGS

Mr. Kinoy made the front pages in August 1966, when he disrupted a hearing of the House Un-American Activities Committee and was ejected. The courts subsequently found him guilty of disorderly conduct. According to HUAC, Mr. Kinoy is vice president of the National Lawyers Guild, which it has cited as a Communist front, and also serves as attorney for the W.E.B. Du Bois Clubs, which J. Edgar Hoover has identified as a youth project of the Communist Party USA.

The New Jersey Bar Association Committee also found nothing wrong with LSP lawyers being on the scene and giving legal advice to people it said were peacefully picketing the Clinton Hall Meat Market in Newark. However, the aforementioned Mr. Kowalewski told the Senate Judiciary Committee that the pickets were lying in the streets and disrupting traffic. He said that after some of the agitators were arrested, the judge released them on their own recognition with the understanding they were not to go back and demonstrate until the courts decided the matter. "These very same people were back out in line the very next day" and LSP attorneys were right there to protect them, Mr. Kowalewski declared.

A demonstration also is the basis for a joint suit by the Philadelphia LSP, known there as Community Legal Services, Inc., and Mr. Kinoy's law firm, Kunstler, Kunstler & Kinoy. They urged a federal takeover of the city police department because of alleged police brutality in connection with a demonstration of 3,500 Negro students at Philadelphia's Board of Education Building last December 9. (The case now has been thrown out of court.)

Testifying in his defense, Police Commissioner Frank L. Rizzo said the demonstration was "a howling mob of completely undisciplined men and women, or minors in age but adults in physical stature." He said he feared they would burn the city down if the police didn't act.

Before the case was dismissed, four Philadelphia lawyers have filed suit in Common Pleas Court for an injunction to stop CLS from proceeding with the suit. They are Samuel Smith, Lenard L. Wolfe, John A. Popola and Neil Carver. They alleged that some of the eight plaintiffs failed to meet standards for indigency to qualify them for CLS aid, since income runs as high as \$15,000 per year. Moreover, the lawyers charged that CLS activities violate the canons of ethics of the American, Pennsylvania and Philadelphia bar associations.

In Indianapolis the local LSP (Indianapolis Legal Services Organization) distributed several thousand cards in the city's low-income neighborhoods giving advice on the art of non-cooperation with the police.

In California, the LSP, known there as California Rural Legal Assistance, has been helping the leftist United Farm Workers. That's a union headed by Cesar Chavez, who, according to Senator George Murphy (R.,

Calif.), is a member of the CRLA board of trustees. A report of the Alabama Legislative Commission to Preserve the Peace, a branch of the Alabama State Legislature, says the union was created in 1965 with the help of known Communists. CRLA won re-instatement and back pay for nine of Mr. Chavez' organizers who allegedly were fired for union activity.

CRLA also brought suit against U.S. Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz to block his approval last fall of the employment of 8,100 Mexicans to harvest crops in California's northern San Joaquin valley. The suit was dismissed after a settlement giving CRLA a voice in importation of the workers. Still, Senator Murphy considered it odd to find two taxpayer-financed agencies battling each other in court.

Clashing with other aims of the government in court has become routine for LSP. In New York City, for instance, LSP has several cases pending against the local public housing authority. The suits challenge refusals to rent to unwed mothers and evictions of tenants for undesirable behavior.

WELFARE PAYMENTS

Some of LSP's most spectacular suits against federal agencies involve welfare payments. In U.S. district courts in Connecticut, Delaware, Pennsylvania and the District of Columbia, LSP attorneys have gained rulings eliminating all residency requirements for welfare payments. The cases inspired the following comments from Representative Joel T. Broyhill (D., Va.): "Instead of protecting the interests of the American people who employ them, they (LSP attorneys) directed their efforts toward destruction of the safeguards of our society."

"They sought to have all welfare residency requirements, both state and federal, declared unconstitutional. They are succeeding."

At OEO headquarters here officials are gleeful at the prospect of winning similar victories in all the estimated 40 states which have residency requirements for welfare payments.

LSP's also are winning some startling and far-reaching decisions in the field of housing code violations, which city governments are supposed to enforce. Last month the LSP won a decision at the D.C. Court of Appeals which held a landlord cannot evict a tenant for nonpayment of rent if the housing was in violation of the D.C. housing code at the time of rental. The property in question had a broken railing, clogged commode and inadequate ceiling height in the basement. LSP argued that these conditions violated the housing code and made the rental contract invalid.

Said LSP national director Johnson: "Since it is binding on all landlord-tenant cases in D.C., it improves the rights and economic condition of the estimated 28,000 residents of more than 100,000 dwelling units in D.C. found to be in violation of the housing code. It also has precedent value outside D.C."

RENT STRIKES

The decision undoubtedly will strengthen LSP in carrying out its announced policy of encouraging rent strikes "to encourage the rights of tenants to withhold rent when their housing is in bad condition."

Barron's asked Donald Stocks, deputy director of LSP at OEO, how it would help poor people to bankrupt many landlords through such practices. He said he believes the answer is for the government to finance slum housing.

Back in 1966, Robert Kirk Walker, president of the Tennessee Bar Association, charged that encouraging rent strikes was tantamount to inciting social revolution. E. Clinton Bamberger, Jr., then director of LSP at OEO headquarters, answered "There's going to be a change in this country. If the lawyers want to watch it and not participate in it, that's your decision."

Those who criticize LSP for battling statutes aimed at discouraging immorality cite specific cases. In Atlantic City, the LSP is challenging the constitutionality of the New Jersey Narcotics Act and has brought suit on behalf of Alfred Washington, a leader of the Afro-American Unity Movement, and two others, Joseph Ruiz and Frank Minio. According to J. Edgar Hoover, the Movement was formed by the late Malcolm X and branched off from the Black Muslims, who advocate a separate black nation. On behalf of Mr. Washington and Messrs. Ruiz and Mino, LSP is contesting the state law requiring dope addicts or users to register with the police.

As the foregoing indicates, LSP is much more interested in changing laws than in handling individual hardship cases. To focus attention on what OEO officials call "poverty law," the agency this year made grants to 11 universities for special efforts in that field. They ranged from \$64,000 to Georgetown University Law Center to \$352,000 to the University of Detroit.

SEEK COURT REVIEW

Still, as it bulldozes down the road to revolution, the LSP is encountering some opposition. The four afore-mentioned Philadelphia lawyers are petitioning the Pennsylvania Supreme Court to review the charter of the Philadelphia LSP. It provides, they say, for a board of directors, a voting majority of which may be non-lawyers, who will hire, fire and control the practice of law by their employees. The practice of law by a corporation, they contend, is unlawful.

The Florida Bar Association has endorsed a resolution noting that the LSP is not authorized in anti-poverty legislation, and "therefore is deficient in providing any safeguards to adequately protect the persons to be served, the public in general and the legal profession."

The Council of the North Carolina State Bar says lawyers on the payrolls of organizations financed by OEO must accept directions in accordance with the agency's guidelines, thereby endangering the traditional attorney-client confidential relationship. Moreover, it points out that OEO is free to change indigency standards at will, "so that, conceivably, most if not all of the people in this country would eventually be entitled to receive free legal services."

The council gives the following warning: "The Legal Services Program as so constituted would seriously cripple or destroy the independence of the legal profession. The concern of the lawyers is not just for lawyers, but for the citizens of this state and nation of all races and creeds and all walks of life. It is their freedom which is at stake . . . and it is vitally important to them that a free and independent legal profession is not killed or seriously crippled."

Thankful

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Athens, Tex., Daily Review commented on the debts and the assets of this modern United States, and the editorial was so fine that it has been widely reprinted. One of the daily newspapers in the First Congressional District of Arkansas, the Paragould Daily Press, carried the editorial in its February 27 issue.

It is a pleasure to bring this powerful comment from the hometown newspaper

of our colleague, the Honorable JOHN DOWDY, to the attention of the Congress.

THANKFUL

The Athens (Tex.) Daily Review reflects: Sometimes when we think about the big bite Uncle Sam gets out of each paycheck, the waste in government, the unrest in our nation, the foreign entanglements and all we begin to wonder...

Then we think of all the fine characteristics of this nation. And we are especially glad that we live in a rural area that is relatively free of a number of the problems that face the huge metropolis.

Among the things the people of this country have a right to be proud of is the fact that with only seven percent of the earth's surface the people of this nation who comprise only six percent of the population are able to produce one-third of the world's goods and services. A nation that can do this is a good nation. Because of the many freedoms we do enjoy, because of the abundance of life, the opportunity that we have and for any one of a hundred other reasons there are millions of people throughout the world who would give anything to make their home in this land.

We take so many of these things for granted. Do you realize that we have the highest income per person; we produce one-fourth of the total steel; we have one-third of all surfaced roads; three-fifths of the world's automobiles; one out of every three college students is a U.S. citizen; we have one-third of the electric power; and no power on earth matches ours industrially or militarily.

We can't all be shirkers. And anyone who thinks the day of opportunity has passed, is out of his mind. It may be more competitive, but the opportunity to get ahead was never better in any nation at any time than it is today in the good old U.S.A.

A Positive Approach to the Travel Deficit

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, you know that as Representative of one of the greatest tourist areas in the United States, I have vigorously worked for the adoption of a positive approach to solving our Nation's "travel deficit." I have been greatly concerned about our failure to make the most of our opportunities to attract foreign visitors to this magnificent country, particularly our failure to provide adequate funding for the U.S. Travel Service and its overseas travel promotion program.

To help remedy this situation I introduced H.R. 3934 to provide the necessary funding and strengthen the U.S. Travel Service's capacity for stimulating tourism here. Now we are being asked to support restrictive legislation to retard international travel rather than promote travel to this country. I cannot support this restrictive course when I know we have not tried the positive approach of an adequate travel promotion program.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation is asking that we try the positive approach rather than take the step of imposing burdensome and unnecessary restrictions. The American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., has registered its views in support of the positive effort embodied in my legislation, and I insert in the RECORD the association's letter to the Honorable chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee of February 19, 1968, to this effect.

The press, too, has found much lacking in the negative proposals to restrict travel. To enable my colleagues to have the benefit of the many articles published on this subject, I also enclose a sampling of editorial views supporting a positive approach to remedying the "travel deficit."

I believe that these materials show that the Nation strongly favors legislation such as I have offered to encourage more visitors to come to the United States.

The material referred to follows:

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF
TRAVEL AGENTS, INC.
New York, N.Y., March 8, 1968.

Re: Proposed Travel Restrictions.

Hon. WILBUR MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On February 19, 1968, I had the privilege of appearing before your Committee on behalf of the American Society of Travel Agents, Inc. (ASTA) in connection with the Committee's consideration of certain proposals by the Secretary of the Treasury designed to deal with the so-called tourist deficit and our balance of payments. During the course of my appearance before the Committee, certain questions were raised and requests were made for additional data. This letter and the attachments are intended to answer those questions and supply the information requested. We would appreciate it if this letter could be included in the record of the hearings.

At the outset, since there does not appear to be a clear understanding as to the role of the travel agent in the United States, the structure of the industry, the manner in which it represents the public and the carriers and its method of compensation, we have prepared the following explanation.

A travel agent is a person, firm, corporation or other business entity engaged in the business of arranging transportation and travel facilities for others for a commission fee or other valuable consideration.

A tour operator is a travel agent who gathers together the transportation and travel facility ingredients including lodging, sightseeing, transfers between hotel and rail or bus depots or airports. Other items such as meals and entertainment may also be included in the tour. The tour may be a package tour which is pre-arranged and designed to fit the requirements of a wide variety of travelers. Some cater to special interest groups, such as skiing enthusiasts, art lovers, etc.

Package tours may be either escorted or unescorted. An escorted tour involves the assistance of an experienced tour director traveling with the group who handles all basic details—hotel reservations, transportations, sightseeing, baggage, customs, language interpretation where necessary, etc. There are also group tours for persons who wish to travel together, and there is the individual independent itinerary which is specially developed to reflect the individual needs and tastes of the client.

The retail travel agent is a travel agent who sells directly to his clients and does not market tours through other outlets. The wholesale-retail travel agent operates tours which he sells through his own retail facilities directly to his own clients and also markets these tours through other travel agents and carrier facilities. The wholesale travel agent does not sell directly to the public, but merchandises his tours through other travel agents and carrier facilities.

Tours are promoted through the medium of advertising, printed folders, etc.

Carriers have formed Conferences which are associations of those carriers having common interests. These carriers through the medium of adopting resolutions which are approved by the appropriate regulatory body of the Federal Government, promulgate procedures and regulations governing travel agents. Such regulations also govern the approval of travel agents by the Conferences, their appointment by the carriers and their retention as approved and appointed travel agents. The conference regulations also govern the rate of commission that carriers who are members of the respective Conferences pay travel agents. In this respect, a principal agency relationship exists between the carriers and the travel agents whom they appoint as their sales outlets.

The Conferences are Air Traffic Conference (ATC)—this is an association of the scheduled domestic airlines.

International Air Transport Association (IATA)—this is an association of U.S. and foreign flag carriers providing airline service between the United States and foreign destinations.

Trans-Atlantic Passenger Steamship Conference and Atlantic Passenger Steamship Conference (TAPSC-APSC)—these are associations of U.S. and foreign flag steamship lines operating service across the Atlantic to and from the United States.

Trans-Pacific Passenger Steamship Conference—this is an association of U.S. and foreign flag steamship lines that operate service from and to the United States across the Pacific Ocean.

In addition to the foregoing there is also the Rail Travel Promotion Agency (RTPA). This is an association of U.S. and Canadian railroads which provide passenger service in those two countries. The Rail Travel Promotion Agency regulates the appointment and retention of travel agents and promulgates other procedures governing the sale of rail transportation by travel agents.

There are some travel agents who are licensed by the Interstate Commerce Commission in the capacity of tour brokers. These travel agents charter buses and operate tours to various domestic points of interest.

A travel agent is professionally required to provide the transportation and travel facilities that best suit the needs of his clients. Obviously unless he does so, he will not long remain in business nor would he be able to receive repeat business from his clients or additional business as a result of their recommendations to their friends and others.

The American Society of Travel Agents is the foremost and most important travel agency association. It represents the professional travel agents in the United States and Canada and was established in 1931. Included in ASTA's more than 7,000 members are travel agencies throughout the world, airlines, steamship lines, railroads, bus lines, car rental firms, hotels, resorts, government tourist offices and other related interests in nearly one hundred countries and territories. In the United States its governing members, i.e. travel agents, operate more than 2,600 travel agency locations.

An important part of the travel agent's payment for services he renders to his clients comes from commissions which he receives from transportation carriers and most hotels. If the service rendered is simply that of procuring a transportation ticket or making a single hotel reservation, there is usually no additional charge to the customer. The travel agent is reimbursed for his time and effort through commissions which he receives from the carrier or hotel. Contrary to popular belief, a travel agent's income is not, however, derived solely from commissions. More complicated travel services—especially pre-arranged tours and independent itineraries—practically always require a charge for the

travel agent's services. An agent, considering the cost of office overhead—trained personnel, rent, phone calls, cables and telegrams—would find it impossible, as would most service organizations, to remain in business if he did not charge the traveler for more complicated travel services.

For 1965, according to domestic airline accounting records, the amount of total bookings of domestic air travel by travel agents was 995 million dollars. Travel agents have increased their proportion of total domestic air travel booked from 27 percent in 1960 to 32 percent in 1965. In addition to the sale of domestic air transportation, travel agents have produced some 23 million dollars annually in railroad passenger transportation. Approximately 85 percent of the passengers leaving these shores for overseas destinations by ships are booked by travel agents. Of those traveling from these shores to overseas destinations by airplane, travel agents account for approximately 65 percent of the bookings. The rate of commissions paid by the Conferences are as follows:

[In percent]

	ATC	IATA	TAPSC	TPPSC
1. Point-to-point transportation.....	5	7	7.0	7.5
2. Round trip transportation.....	5	7	7.0	7.5-10
3. Cruises.....			17.5	10.0
4. Tours.....	10	10	10.0	10.0

¹ On the Caribbean cruises 10 percent commission is paid. The cruises do not come under the conference unless they involve a transatlantic crossing such as a Mediterranean cruise or a North Cape cruise or around-the-world cruise.

Railroads that participate in the Rail Travel Promotion Agency pay commission to travel agents on passenger bookings. Others do not. There may be some variation within the railroads as far as the rate of commissions paid is concerned. This depends upon the individual decision of the railroad involved.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TYPICAL AGENT

Despite the total volume of business produced by the travel agents for their principals, the travel agency industry is for the most part composed of small businessmen. Most agencies are entities at a single location only—73 percent of the 5,175 travel agents approved by the Air Traffic Conference. The rest are home offices and their branches: 470 or 9 percent of the total are home offices and 929 or 18 percent are branches. A few companies account for a large number of branches: American Express, 70 branches in the U.S.; Cooks with 34 and Ask Mr. Foster with 32, are the three companies with the greatest number according to the previously-referred to report of Systems Analysis and Research Corporation entitled *Airline/Travel Agent Marketing Study*.

Agents vary widely in characteristics. In 1965, according to the SARC Report, the following was a very generalized picture of the median agent, excluding very large, very small, and specialized agencies.

In location, he was generally within a metropolitan city that had a number of airline city ticket offices, and he had no branch offices. In bookings, his total of all travel was \$400,000, of which domestic air was \$170,000. His gross travel revenue from all commissions was about \$25,000, and he spent about \$2,400 on promotion. Of his domestic air bookings, about 70 percent was nonbusiness and 30 percent business; of his domestic air total, credit sales were 20 percent and tours/packages about 20 percent. He had four full-time and one part-time employees. In organization, he was a corporation, had been in business nine years of which six were under the present owner, had no nontravel business, booked retail only, and was a member of ATC and IATA and three other Conferences. The

median agent books about 20 percent of his total domestic air travel in tours or packages. Total bookings of domestic air tours by agents in 1965 amounted to about \$275 million compared to \$12 million by domestic airlines.

An inclusive or "package" tour is a pre-arranged journey composed of air transportation, sleeping or hotel accommodations plus other facilities or attractions such as transfers between the airport and the hotel, sightseeing, motor coach trips and car rentals. Except for the air transportation, all the other component parts of the tour are commonly referred to as the "land portion."

The regulations of the International Air Transportation Association require the air transportation portion to be either a round or circle trip; and the price of the "land portion" must be at least 20 percent of the air fare or \$15 per day, whichever is greater. Tours between the Western Hemisphere and Europe, Africa and the Middle East, must provide for a minimum of six nights sleeping or hotel accommodations.

In the United States, the regulations governing tours are basically similar to those stated above except that the formula to determine the minimum price for the "land" portion is related to the fare as follows: Where the fare is \$75 or less, the land arrangements must be at least \$15; if the fare is more than \$75 but less than \$175, the land portion must equal at least 20 percent, and for fare of \$175 or more, the minimum price for the land arrangements is \$35.00. In addition, such tours must provide for overnight lodging in at least two noncontiguous cities or localities.

Tours are produced by specialized travel agents commonly known as wholesalers or tour operators and may be sold directly by them, but most often are sold through retail agents or air carriers.

Tours must be approved by the air carrier whose services are featured and must be advertised and published at the producer's sole cost and expense in tour folders or brochures, the contents of which are proscribed by air carrier regulations, and contain the itinerary, features, maps, photographs, price, terms and conditions of the offering.

Tours are designed for both group and individual travel, and may or may not be escorted.

A tour may be based on normal, special or excursion fares, and, when a special or excursion fare is used, is subject to the terms and conditions applicable to such fare.

The Group Inclusive Tour Basing Fare, referred to in our testimony as the GIT fare, has been established by the International Air carriers for transportation across the North Atlantic in connections with inclusive tours. These fares are available for groups of 15 passengers or more to Europe and the Middle East and are between \$157 to \$292 lower than the normal or regular fares to Europe, depending on the destination.

In addition, other important developments have taken place. For example, on February 23, 1968, President Johnson in a special message to the Congress, urged the elimination of certain visa requirements for tourists visiting the United States. This bill, H.R. 15651, has been introduced by Chairman Celler of the House Committee on the Judiciary to implement this proposal. This was a specific recommendation in the McKinney report, and clearly designed to facilitate tourism to this country.

ASTA, in a letter commending Ambassador McKinney for his report, pledged its support to all reasonable and necessary steps designed to implement the recommendations contained in it. Because of our access to all facts of the travel agency industry, ASTA is uniquely equipped to provide valuable assistance in the machinery which we understand will be set up to provide for government-industry cooperation in implementing

immediately the recommendations in this report.

As an immediate step to reflect ASTA's determination of full cooperation, a meeting will be called shortly at ASTA's invitation of tour operators in the United States, approximately 90 percent of whom are members of ASTA for the specific purpose of implementing the concessions contained in the McKinney report, thus making it possible to package together low priced, attractive and saleable tours for travel within the United States designed for overseas visitors particularly from Europe.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we trust that the supplemental material contained in this letter will be of assistance to the Committee and we will be happy to provide any additional data or views that the Committee might find useful. We hope that the Committee in its deliberations will not adopt restrictive legislation which would have the effect of inhibiting the right of U.S. citizens to travel abroad, since to do so would make effective implementation of a positive program impossible. As a much more effective and desirable alternative rather, we urge the Committee to heed the advice of the more than 60 witnesses who appeared before it during the two weeks of public hearings and allow industry with the encouragement and cooperation of the government to embark upon a crash program designed to promote increased tourism to this country, and to bring our travel account into equilibrium by expanding substantially the already dramatic success that our government has realized in becoming the world's number one host country.

Sincerely yours,

IRVIN M. FRANKEL,

Chairman,

Governmental Affairs Committee.

ADDITIONS BY AMERICAN SOCIETY OF TRAVEL AGENTS TO HEARING TRANSCRIPT

ATTACHMENT A

On page 459 of the transcript insert:

"United States airlines will increase their promotional efforts by 53 percent in 1968, thus making a total of approximately \$17 million in media advertising alone. The statistics on promotional investment by the maritime industry are to be supplied directly to the Committee.

"Robert E. Short, National Chairman of Discover America, Inc., has stated that his organization will increase travel promotions along the Discover America theme to more than \$300 million in 1968.

"Other witnesses who appeared before the Committee will be supplying additional economic data in connection with total expenditures by private industry including foreign airlines."

ATTACHMENT B

On page 471 of the transcript insert:

"An ASTA survey conducted early in the week of March 4 among 12 of the largest tour operators involved in travel to Europe and the Orient showed the following results:

"Cancellations from the first of the year have raised from 5 percent to 20 percent and averaged 12 percent.

"Advanced bookings as of the end of February were down from 20 percent to 40 percent compared with the same period last year. The average reduction of advanced bookings was 32.5 percent. One major element in foreign travel has been particularly affected. This is the incentive tour program which is used by many corporations as rewards for performance. Three major tour operator producers of incentive groups reported bookings outside the Western Hemisphere have been virtually eliminated; they are down 90 percent compared with the same time a year ago. These companies report that many of these incentive tours have been diverted to the Western Hemisphere, including the United States.

"As far as the other tour operators are concerned, since they specialize in their particular areas, they have no way of reporting the degree to which travel business has been salvaged through diversion to the Western Hemisphere. However, ASTA's own survey of its member agents, shows that at the retail level, only 14 percent of business lost to non-Western Hemisphere destinations has been held by diversion to the Western Hemisphere.

"In summary, travel business outside the Western Hemisphere among these twelve major tour operators is down 44.5 percent through cancellations and fall off in advanced bookings. Little has been recovered in terms of travel in this hemisphere. Incentive group travel outside the Western Hemisphere is virtually eliminated.

"Thus, two points are clear: the mere discussion of these proposals has already had a major effect on reducing expenditures by U.S. citizens overseas, and, second, that the effect on the industry itself is so severe, that many are threatened with the extinction of their taxpaying businesses; no travel agent or tour operator is large enough to survive an extended period of business loss of this magnitude."

ATTACHMENT C

On page 479 of the transcript insert:

"Approximately 18 months ago, the British Government imposed a currency restriction on citizens traveling out of the country, by limiting to £50 the amount of money persons traveling for personal reasons could spend. A provision was made for prepayment of transportation costs which did not apply to the allowance. The effect of the currency restrictions is unclear. However, there are some indications that it has not served as a deterrent to tourism. For example, according to the statistics of the United States Department of Commerce, tourism from Britain to the United States during 1967, the first full year when the restriction was in effect, tourism increased by 18 percent.

"The British travel industry strenuously opposed the imposition of this currency restriction when it was initially proposed. We are informed that a new effort will be made very shortly to convince the British Government to abandon the currency restriction on the theory that it has not been effective, and it has led to evasion and, in general, an undesirable and restrictive measure."

ATTACHMENT D

On page 487 of the transcript insert:

"The January 1968 report of the Passport Office Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the United States Department of State stated as follows:

"Proposed Length of Stay: Eighty-three percent of the passport recipients during the calendar year 1967 planned trips lasting less than six months. Of this group, 61 percent indicated trips lasting one month to trips of less than one month; and 3 percent planned trips lasting from two months to less than six months."

"Table 10 of the report entitled 'Proposed Length of Stay' for the year 1967 and the same report in Table 8 entitled 'Object of Travel' for the year 1967 are attached (not printed in the Record).

"We have been advised by the Passport Office that it does not now currently cross-tabulate its statistics on the object of travel with the estimated length of stay for applicants of passports. However, this information could be compiled with relative ease by the Passport Office."

ATTACHMENT E

On page 473 of the transcript, Mr. Frankel was asked to estimate loss of federal revenue from reduced income tax receipts. The information in Attachment C is the best effort that we can make in connection with that general question.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 13, 1968]

ABOARD FLIGHT 100: PASSENGERS TO LONDON TALK OF A TRAVEL TAX AND MANY OTHER THINGS—LEVY IS ASSAILED—BUSINESSMEN SAY IT COULD HURT THEM—WOULD IT FOSTER CHEATING?—HAWKES, DOVES, AND A REAL LADY

(By Felix Kessler)

ABOARD PAN AMERICAN FLIGHT 100.—Lady d'Avigdor-Goldsmid, comfortably sprawled across all three tourist-section seats, puts down her book and smiles broadly when asked whether hers is a business or pleasure trip.

"Pleasure, pleasure," she says, relighting her cigar. "Almost wicked, isn't it? One should feel guilty, I suppose."

She confesses, guiltily, that her tastes run to "the nice things—French clothes, Italian silks." Yet Britain's stringent travel regulations restrict the amount of money she can take out annually to a very basic 50 pounds, or £120, excluding air fare. How could she manage a 21-day excursion trip to Nassau and New York? "I stay with friends," says Lady d'Avigdor-Goldsmid, wife of a bullion broker who is a Member of Parliament.

Lady d'Avigdor-Goldsmid's travel tips—staying with friends, flying tourist class and finding other economies—should be noted by Americans. For if President Johnson has his way, traveling Americans may soon be in penny-pinching circumstances themselves. He has proposed a graduated tax based on the amount spent while traveling abroad; it would affect both tourists and businessmen. Though there are indications Congress may shelve the proposal, it still is alive and must be considered by anyone planning a trip abroad a few months hence.

BRITONS AND BUSINESSMEN

To get an idea of the kind of people who would pay these taxes, I booked a seat on a Pan American World Airways flight to London in order to interview my fellow passengers. It turns out that among them are a surprisingly large number of Britons who, like Lady d'Avigdor-Goldsmid, struggle imaginatively on limited allotments. Also aboard:

The comptroller of a business machines concern that finds European markets a "very important" factor in the company's annual sales.

Two executives of a giant U.S. oil company traveling to check on their overseas tanker operations.

A tax lawyer for another oil company.

A restaurant owner and his wife, combining a two-week vacation with an attempt to lure an Austrian chef to Pennsylvania.

A family of four on their first trip to Europe.

All the Americans I interview are, as might be expected, firmly against travel taxes. Their opposition ranges from the ideological—"it's un-American" and "an unfortunate new form of isolationism"—to the practical: A businessman argues that his company, which he says earns more than it spends abroad and thereby aids the payments balance, would be unfairly penalized by the restrictions.

Ironically, much support and sympathetic understanding of the need for travel curbs comes from the Britons. "You Americans have been so fantastically generous to the whole world and get so little thanks for it," comments one. "If you hadn't done so much, you wouldn't be in this fix now."

OUR MAN TAKES OFF

Flight 100 leaves daily at 10 a.m. from Kennedy Airport to New York for the 6-hour, 40-minute flight to London. On my Monday flight, the Boeing 707-321B lifts off the runway at 10:20 with 14 first-class seats occupied (out of 20 available) and 85 economy-class passengers aboard (out of 115 seats). A Pan Am spokesman says this is slightly below normal for the day and season but

declines to assign any reason—such as concern over foreign travel—to the drop.

One first-class passenger (\$712.50 round-trip) is the business machine company's comptroller, who has hung up his jacket and put on a pair of slippers provided by the airline. A seasoned traveler who takes four trips abroad a year, he says that 10 of his colleagues regularly visit the company's 11 European offices. "Every trip contributes something to our overall export picture," he says.

His company's sales, domestic and foreign, topped \$175 million in 1967 and were expected—before the Administration's curbs on travel and on foreign investment were announced—to top \$200 million this year. This executive says his company will "not be hurt too much" by this crackdown. "But a company that's just starting out to expand overseas will really be handicapped," he says.

The executive has "verbal instructions from our president to keep down costs." In his attache case, he carries a copy of Europe on \$5 a Day; he believes, however, that \$25 is a more reasonable expectation of a businessman's daily minimum expense. Under the Administration's tax plan, only the first \$7 a traveler spends daily would be tax exempt; the next \$8 would be taxed at 15% and everything beyond that would be taxed at 30%.

TWO WEEKS AND \$2,500

When I ask whether his company's cost-cutting might in the future extend to economy tickets, the executive appears flustered and begs that I not use his name. Other business travelers make similar requests.

Another first-class passenger, describing himself only as "in export-import," dismisses the tax proposal with a wave of his hand. "How can I live in London on \$7 a day?" he asks. "I can't even live on 7 pounds a day." Seven pounds equals \$16.80.

Toward the rear of the plane in an economy seat—18 inches wide as opposed to the 23-inch first-class seat—Howell Yogg, of Millburn, N.J., says only partly in jest that he expects to spend \$7 daily in tips. "I know my hotels are all in the \$20-a-day class," says Mr. Yogg. "I've got a two-week trip planned and \$2,500 in travelers checks in my pocket, although I'm not saying I'll spend all that."

Mr. Yogg sold his display-sign business recently and aims to discuss with European bankers the possibility of a similar venture there. He also plans to buy a new Mercedes 280 in Germany, although the Internal Revenue Service ruled recently that Americans buying foreign cars overseas would have to pay a 7% excise levy—in addition to import duties—when they bring them home.

"I'll be \$1,000 ahead, even at 7%," claims Mr. Yogg, "but that's not the point. I'd still buy the car. I have friends who buy German machinery, which sometimes costs more than American-made, because they say it's better."

Sitting near Mr. Yogg are two industrial relations officials for an oil company. Both are behavioral scientists on a brief trip to examine their British affiliate's tanker operations. They fly Pan Am because of a company policy to use American carriers; company policy also dictates they go economy (\$399 round-trip).

THE OILMEN

One man is on his first trip to Europe; the other makes several yearly. They will be taking a look at how "the landlubbers and seamen are working together on the tankers," says the more experienced traveler. "But it all comes down to the question, 'How can tankers carry crude oil more cheaply so that we can bring the cost down at the pump level?'"

He says his company won't reduce the travels or expenses of its technical experts and engineers as a result of any tax measure. However, he adds, "there might come a point where fewer of us would go. If the taxes were

now in force, maybe only one of us would be on this plane. Or maybe we'd just try to do the whole thing by phone." He believes that sales and efficiency would be hurt by the travel regulations.

Both men are against the tax for philosophical as well as economic reasons. "We desperately need to create more understanding for ourselves," says one, "and instead we're withdrawing into a new isolationism. In a democracy, people have a right to travel." Both are Vietnam doves, declaring that a withdrawal there would be immeasurably more productive than any travel tax program.

(For a completely different political reason, a hawkish New York security analyst on Flight 100 opposes the travel tax because "we should be encouraging people to travel, not discourage them. Only by Americans going abroad will people get an idea that we're not all like that Dr. Spock.")

Across the aisle from the oil man sits a tax lawyer for a rival oil company. He finds the tax proposals undesirable. "Ultimately, our exports will be operating at a greater disadvantage because of the investment curbs and travel restrictions," he says. "If American corporations lose their edge, who knows how long it will take for them to regain it—if ever."

A NOT-SO-GOOD MOVIE

The lawyer—who also asks to remain anonymous—does cut his outlays by \$2.50 on this trip by politely rejecting the stewardess' offer to rent earphones and watch the movie. But this saving isn't due to company policy. "I haven't found movies on these flights to be very good," he explains. Indeed, Flight 100's offering, *The Biggest Bundle of Them All*, isn't very good, another passenger says later.

J. H. S. Jervis, an ex-British navy pilot returning to London after a round of job interviews in the U.S., finds still another ground to oppose the proposed travel tax. It would "teach people to be fiddlers," he says. "You know, how to put \$20 in the back pocket without getting caught. That's what the English do, I regret to say. People are basically honest, but your professional traveler will find ways of getting around" without the tax.

A businessman on Flight 100 agrees. If travel is taxed, he says, businessmen would just quietly draw on funds from their European subsidiaries. Asked whether this wouldn't contravene the law, he says, "Yes, but we'd do it."

George E. Catlin, a British political scientist returning to London after attending a conference at New York University, says the U.S. must do something about its adverse payments balance. "Tourism is a luxury that can be controlled," says Mr. Catlin, but then he hedges by adding, "provided this doesn't produce a disadvantageous reaction." Mr. Catlin's trip to the U.S. didn't cut into his travel allotment; all his expenses were paid by his New York hosts.

Britons without hosts to pick up tabs manage to do a considerable amount of traveling despite the restrictions designed to keep them from spending more than 50 pounds abroad. For instance, Lady d'Avigdor-Goldsmid's daughter, Chloe, described in a lengthy article in London's *Sunday Times* how she and a friend toured the Soviet Union by car the previous summer; they kept costs down by camping out.

Britons are allowed to pay for their round-trip transportation costs without touching the travel allotment. By contrast, the U.S. proposal calls for a 5% tax on the airline ticket for travel overseas and back; transportation costs on side trips would be assessed under the higher, travel-spending tax. (The tough restrictions on Britons, incidentally, make you wonder about the efforts to promote more trips to the U.S. among the British. A lot of 50-pound spenders are needed to close the travel gap.)

Surprisingly, the Britons say they're under no pressure to fly BOAC, their nationalized airline. Mrs. Gertrude Chinman, who is returning to London after visiting a married daughter in Syracuse, is flying on Pan Am because "I came with them and see no point in changing." She seems surprised when I suggest that her defense of travel curbs—"We've had to tighten our belts, and I think you Americans should too"—might logically imply that she should travel BOAC. In contrast, an American businessman aboard Flight 100 makes abundantly clear that he has switched from BOAC to Pan Am only out of patriotism.

TALKING WITH THE KNUTHS

Mr. and Mrs. Howard Knuth own the Cascade Lounge, a restaurant in Bucks County, Pa., and are among the few passengers who will stay with Flight 100 as it continues to Frankfurt after landing in London. After visiting relatives, Mr. Knuth hopes to interview two prospective Austrian chefs, though he doesn't think he will persuade either to come to the U.S.

Mr. Knuth, who goes to Europe every two or three years, says he wasn't deterred from this year's trip by President Johnson's plea that Americans defer for two years nonessential travel out of the Western Hemisphere. "I don't believe that's fair," says Mr. Knuth. "As Americans, I believe we have the right to spend our money as we wish." He adds that, in his opinion, a travel tax could never be equitable, nor would it stop a significant amount of overseas trips.

The family of Stanley Pfeiffer, a Newton, N.J., auto dealer, occupies four seats in the six-across tourist seating arrangement. The Pfeiffers and their children, Jill, 10½, and Mark, 13½, are traveling to a four-day group study meeting at the Hubbard College of Scientology in East Grinstead, a good hour's drive by taxi from London Airport.

Mr. Pfeiffer considers the conference on scientology (an outgrowth of a personality behavior theory known as dianetics) to be strong enough motivation for the trip, despite the President's appeal to avoid unnecessary travel abroad. He describes the Johnson travel measures as "trying to put out an oil fire with a bucket of water." (Air travel evidently inspires such flights of metaphor. Mr. Yogg sees the travel tax as "taking aspirin for a case of cancer.")

Finished with the Pfeiffers, I return to my seat. Not long after, a passenger comes by and expresses disappointment that I haven't interviewed him. He is John Howard, an Australian free-lance journalist living in Rome, and he specializes in movie and fan-magazine articles. Mr. Howard is dismayed because, under a travel curb, his American editors wouldn't visit Europe. "The more they come over, the more business I do," he says.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Feb. 7, 1968]

AN ABOMINABLE TAX

It would be hard to devise a scheme more intricate, more difficult to enforce, and more contrary to American traditions of liberty than the proposed travel tax which the administration has dumped in the lap of Congress. Or, for that matter, one less likely to make a significant dent in the balance-of-payments deficit, which Secretary Fowler described as "intolerable."

Not even the administration expects the proposed tax to cut tourist spending overseas by more than 200 or 250 million dollars a year. This is almost trivial when compared with the dollar deficit of about 3.6 billion dollars, or with total tourist spending of about 4 billion dollars, or with the government's own spending abroad on foreign aid, which has been estimated at about 8 billion dollars a year.

In order to bring about this modest saving, American travelers are threatened with

a ridiculous amount of red tape and bureaucratic snooping. Anyone planning to leave the western hemisphere would have to file a tax return stating how long he expected to be overseas and how much he expected to spend there. If he expected to spend more than \$7 a day, he would have to pay in advance a tax on the excess: 15 per cent up to \$15 a day, and 30 per cent over that.

Upon leaving the country, he would have to file a declaration stating how much he was taking with him in cash and travelers checks, "subject to verification by customs officials or other treasury officials" [meaning they could search him]. He would have to pay a 5 per cent tax on his air line or other transportation. Upon his return he would have to declare how much money he had left [and perhaps display it], and within 60 days he would have to file a final return listing his expenses, reporting any money he received abroad beyond what he took with him, and paying any remaining tax due.

Rules like these have been tried by other countries but have never worked. For those who want to evade them, there are at least two ways around every rule. Even with complete public cooperation, they would be difficult to enforce. The purpose of the proposal is to discourage travel, but, to the extent that it does, it would infringe upon what the Supreme Court has declared to be an inalienable right, "a constitutional liberty closely related to rights of free speech and association." In the words of Justice Douglas, an inveterate globe-trotter himself, "Free movement by the citizen . . . is the very essence of our free society."

True, the court was talking about the right of Communists and others to travel abroad against the wishes of the state department. But this makes the proposed restrictions all the more offensive. The administration is not only asking us, as tourists, to atone for its own fiscal sins, but it also wants to impose on a right which the Supreme Court has guaranteed even to Communists in our midst. And all in the dubious hope of trimming at most one-twelfth from the "intolerable" deficit.

[From the Honolulu (Hawaii) Advertiser]

A NEGATIVE TAX

It is difficult to see why President Johnson now wants to make Mainland-to-Hawaii travel subject to the same 5 per cent tax that applies within the continental U.S.

True, Hawaii and Alaska have enjoyed a special exemption. This was in recognition of their distance from other states, which is more than that to many foreign countries.

Travel industry figures don't see the added \$5 on a \$100 fare as an especially significant factor that would deter much travel to here. But whatever effect it does have would be negative, against travel to Hawaii and Alaska.

Yet the order on Hawaii and Alaska was just a sidelight on the Administration's purpose. This goal was not to raise tax revenue but to apply the domestic tax to international flights, and so further curtail foreign travel and help ease the gold outflow.

An obvious equal goal should be to stimulate more travel within the U.S. by Americans and foreigners—and this would include to Hawaii and Alaska.

What should have been done toward this end, therefore, was to not add the tax to Hawaii and Alaska but to remove it for all U.S. travel. That would have made travel within this country more attractive for everyone.

The airline industry showed part of the right idea last week when it announced a new 50 per cent discount promotional fare for visitors from abroad who travel within the continental U.S.

The hope is that this special fare can be applied to Hawaii and Alaska—and perhaps to American Samoa, Guam and even the Trust Territory.

Again, the 5 per cent may not be significant, but it hardly seems to be thinking in the right direction.

[From the New York Post]

A TRAVEL TAX ON GIs?

(By Art Buchwald)

WASHINGTON.—I received an inspired letter from a young draftee friend of mine who is soon slated to go to Vietnam:

"DEAR ART: I notice that President Johnson wants to put a head tax on tourists traveling outside the Western Hemisphere. As a loyal soldier who supports my Commander-in-Chief, I believe that not only should this tax be placed on tourists, but also on GIs to discourage them from going to Vietnam.

"Now it's true that many GIs I have talked to had their hearts set on going to Vietnam, but I'm sure that a majority of them could be persuaded to postpone their trip if it were explained to them that our balance-of-payments situation was at stake.

"Everyone knows one of the reasons for the U. S. gold outflow is that so much money is being spent in Vietnam. If every American soldier, sailor and marine who had planned to go to Southeast Asia this year would stay home, we could save millions and millions of dollars, which could go toward building President Johnson's Great Society.

"I have talked to all the guys in my outfit and you would be amazed and proud of how they reacted to my suggestion. Tony Morelli, who sleeps in the bunk on top of me, said, 'I had my heart set on going to Vietnam, but I think we have to put our country's economic plight ahead of our personal pleasure. I'm willing to make the sacrifice and stay here if it will help the U. S. Treasury Dept. to get straightened out.'

"Rory Schwartz said, 'Nobody likes to pay taxes, but if taxing GIs so they won't go to Vietnam is in the national interest, then I have to go along with it. Hell, there are more important things in my life than visiting Vietnam.'

"Charley O'Brien also said that he would prefer to stay in the Western Hemisphere for the next few years. 'I say if you've seen one Vietnam, you've seen them all, and I don't want people pointing at me someday and saying I was the cause of the gold drain.'

"A few of the noncoms don't seem to have the patriotic spirit. When I suggested our outfit stay at home, my sergeant blew up and said we were going abroad whether President Johnson liked it or not. He said, 'A guy dreams of going to Vietnam all his life. He scrims and saves to make it possible, and then someone comes along and says he can't go because it's going to cost the United States too much money. Well, I might not have the American spirit, but I'm taking all of you with me whether you want to go or not.'

"I got the same reaction from the captain, who doesn't think he can make major until he gets some Vietnam under his belt. I asked him if I could write to President Johnson suggesting my tax plan for GIs, and he practically threw me out of the office. He just didn't want to save the taxpayers any money.

"Since I can't write to the President directly without being court-martialed, will you make the suggestion? The tax could be based on rank. Enlisted men would be taxed \$7 a day for every day they spent in Vietnam and officers \$15 a day. Even those who could afford it might hesitate to pay that kind of money to go to Southeast Asia when there is so much more to see here at home.

"There will probably be some squawks from Congress, but the way to get around that is to say the head tax on GIs is only a temporary measure, and as soon as the balance-of-payments picture gets straightened out, it will be lifted. Then any GI who wants

to go to that part of the world will be able to do so.

"I hope you think this is as good an idea as the guys in the barracks do.

"Please tell President Johnson we support him almost 100 per cent in his request that Americans not go abroad at this crucial time."

[From the Wall Street Journal]

EUROPE ON \$7 A DAY

The striking thing about the Administration's proposed travel tax is that it is intentionally designed to interfere with the liberties of American citizens.

That the tax will inhibit the ability of ordinary Americans to travel to Europe is not merely an unfortunate side effect. The whole purpose of the proposal is to allow the Government, in its ultimate wisdom and benevolence, to control the movement and spending of its citizens.

It is all very well for the Administration to cloud the coercive intentions of the tax with deductions and other gimmicks. Yet in doing so it paints a curious picture of its own notions of social worth. It allows a \$7 daily allowance free and taxes the next \$8 a day at half the ordinary 30% rate.

The intention, apparently, is to avoid interfering with the dirty shirt set, skylarking students and other minimal spenders. But the modest American who has put aside \$1,000—say, \$200 a year for five years—for the total expenses of three weeks in Europe will find he now needs about 15% more, which will prove painful if not prohibitive.

To help enforce these elevated and discriminating notions, the traveler is faced with elaborate methods of repression. Report and justify and post bond before you can be released from the United States.

It is also very well for the Administration to say the tax will expire in two years if Congress enacts it at all, but that is one we have heard before. Our own morning line has very long odds on this tax passing from the national scene any time before the current Administration does.

Especially so since the Administration is doing nothing to attack the more basic causes of the balance-of-payments problem. It is not in any significant way cutting back on its own overseas commitments, which lie much nearer to the heart of the problem than tourism does. Nor is it pursuing the Governmental austerity at home which is the only internationally proven cure for payments deficits. At the same time it proposes the travel tax it presents a budget with a deficit, if everything goes exactly perfectly, of some \$8 billion.

The travel tax, then, is merely the latest edition of a weary story. For the mistakes of their governors, the people will pay, not only with their money but with their freedom.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL

(By Erwin D. Canham)

Americans desiring to travel abroad for pleasure are on tenterhooks. And the travel industry, internationally speaking, is in a state of uncertainty and alarm. Therefore it will be very desirable if the administration can clarify as soon as possible what the exact situation is going to be regarding the use of dollars by travelers.

Having recently written that there are no easy solutions to problems like the United States adverse balance of payments, let me add that limitations on American travel seem uniquely distasteful. They interfere with what Americans have long regarded as a basic right.

Spokesmen for the travel industry feel their business is being made a scapegoat. Interested bystanders wonder whether the proposed restrictions can be enforced or would be productive.

WHO WILL BE HIT?

Will there be some sort of exit tax, as a deterrent alone, for the revenue it might produce would not help the balance of payments? Would such a tax be enforced against travelers via Canada? Would not such a tax deter people of modest means, like schoolteachers and students and retired folk, rather than the affluent jet set?

Will there be some form of currency control, as exists in some other countries? Will the parting Americans have to declare the moneys they are taking with them, and will they have to be searched? Such controls are not easy to enforce.

How will the line between business and pleasure trips be defined and enforced, especially with trips having mixed purposes? Can a businessman take his wife or family? Could a business traveler go to Zurich but not to the Bernese Oberland?

Or will the whole business be left in the category of voluntary compliance, or patriotism? Would not such a situation discriminate against the conscientious and leave untouched the unscrupulous?

BALANCE CHECKED

Do we know with any degree of accuracy what is the balance sheet of travel? Many overseas governments and enterprises maintain offices and facilities in the United States, and spend extensively for advertising and promotion. Nearly all overseas airlines buy many of their jet planes from American manufacturers. How much would these expenditures be expected to shrink?

President Johnson has taken some steps to promote more extensive travel by people from abroad in the United States. This expansive direction is the way to proceed.

We should have more, not less travel, and move toward balancing American expenditures in foreign travel by making foreign travel in the United States more attractive and economical. Package tours, cut rate tours, moderate rates in hotels, motels, and restaurants could do a lot to help. Even subsidies.

This is the jet age, and it is not going to be repealed. Artificial barriers cannot last. Stop-gap measures may be needed sometimes, but the chances of doing more harm than good should be examined realistically.

SELF-DEFEATING

Indeed, it is admitted that a good deal else in President Johnson's program would be self-defeating if carried on very long or applied very severely. Orthodox economists also believe the program does not really get down to fundamentals. Its effect on a balanced budget and a stable, uninflated economy in the United States, would be minimal.

President Johnson and Rep. Wilbur Mills will really have to come to a meeting of minds. The range of federal economies must be spelled out.

President Johnson should yield to the long-standing appeal of Mr. Mills for a good housecleaning review of the federal establishment, like the Hoover Commission. Such a review is periodically essential. And it would be good politics in 1968.

Probably no part of the President's program would do more harm in the long run than the curbs on investment and lending. Such dollars are advanced because they will produce higher over-all total earnings than on the domestic market. They should not be restricted except briefly and on an emergency basis.

The world is shrinking. Let us not Balkanize it.

[From the New York Post]

JUNKETS AND TRAVEL TAXES

Treasury Secretary Fowler has appeared before a Congressional committee to outline the Administration's proposals for a rigorous tax on travelers. Each house of Congress will be able to muster impressively large

votes on this important measure—especially if all the Congressmen who embarked on overseas junkets this year are back in time for the roll calls.

At the last unofficial count, roughly three dozen tax-free tourists from Capitol Hill had responded to President Johnson's pleas for restraint on nonessential travel by setting sail for distant lands. Congressmen are used to seeing Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia and South America on \$50 a day—the official expense allowance. Under the President's plan, a private citizen who regaled himself at that rate for 17 days would be taxed close to \$200.

Some of the Congressional junketeers maintain that their tours have no adverse effect on the balance of payments deficit—which the travel tax is designed to reduce. The Treasury refutes these claims decisively. Nor are many of these excursions demonstrably essential to the national interest.

In other words, Congressional junketing as usual violates both the purpose and the spirit of the travel-tax legislation on which Congress is about to pass. Do the majority leaders, the minority leaders and the committee chairmen have any proposals to deal with this clear conflict of interest?

TRAVEL TRAUMA

(By John Chamberlain)

If you send a boy to do a man's job, he's got to be some boy. But in proposing a travel tax on American citizens to cut the deficit in our balance of payments, the Administration would be sending a baby on a Batman's mission.

The U.S. Treasury estimates of the amount of balance of payments savings that would derive from limiting tourist travel run between \$300 and \$500 million a year. It looks like a tidy sum, but saving it is to be achieved by doing conspicuous hurt to a lot of vocal foreigners in the hotel, restaurant, amusement, and air travel business who would assuredly do their best to provoke retaliation. By drumming up further distrust of America, the outraged critics would lend impetus to the move to cash in paper dollars for gold. This could be truly ominous, for there are already 10 times more dollars in foreign hands than would be saved in a year by all of the Administration's defensive proposals. Given the atmosphere of revenge that a tourist tax is bound to create, our \$12 billion in gold would melt away like snow in April.

The sad thing about it is that the nagging negativism of the Administration is entirely unnecessary. There are several good ideas floating around the halls of Congress that might be picked up by an Administration eager to close the balance of payments gap by a positive expansion of the world's energies. For example, Representative Henry Reuss of Wisconsin has proposed a travel incentive subsidy to Europeans who are anxious to visit America, cashable in the form of stamps at hotels and on air lines and trains. Reuss thinks the expansion of business that would result from this would generate the taxes needed to pay for the subsidy.

This column has already written about Eugene M. Lang's ideas for giving tax incentives to exporters and to small American companies which have patents and know-how to contribute to overseas industries in exchange for stock. Vance Hartke of Indiana is among those senators who have expressed an interest in Mr. Lang's proposals. Mr. Lang, for purposes of identification, is a New Yorker who has specialized in acting abroad as an agent for American businessmen who lack the time and the knowledge to cope with unfamiliar language, laws; and markets for themselves.

If the travel tax measures aren't defeated or drastically modified in the House of Representatives, Sen. Hartke will certainly do

his best to beat them in the Senate. "Although most of today's Americans may not travel abroad," so Hartke says, "there exists a growing resentment against prohibition or restrictions of individual movement. If such opposition to curtailing a traditional American liberty does not manifest itself, I should have strong concerns for passive acceptance here of totalitarianism in other and greater forms."

Sen. Hartke is very much aware of the huge refugee "Eurodollar" pool that exists abroad. Consisting of dollars held by overseas American companies and by Europeans, this pool amounts to more than \$16 billion, which is more than the whole U.S. gold reserve. It stays abroad for reinvestment because of the Interest Equalization tax. If repatriated and reported as earnings, it would be subject to the regular 48 per cent corporate tax rate. Hartke says "we could bring at least two billion dollars of it home immediately, with more to come, if we would immediately reduce the tax to 26 per cent. Strangely the Administration misses the point that our tax structure places us in the ridiculous position of raising a kind of tariff barrier against the return of our own dollars."

The main foreign threat to the dollar derives from the fear of Europeans that Washington has no will to maintain its value at home. We can see why the Europeans distrust us. There is the copper strike, for example. This has gone on interminably, yet it could have been stopped by the Administration under existing law. By forcing Americans to purchase copper overseas, the strike has already cost more than \$100 million in dollar outflow. This is between one-third and one-fifth of what the Administration hopes to save by slapping at would-be tourists.

The dollar could be defended by measures that would enhance American liberties, not curtail them. But this Administration, we are sadly forced to conclude, can think only in terms of taking our freedoms away.

(From the San Diego (Calif.) Union,
Feb. 9, 1968]

FREEDOM DEVALUED: TAX ON TRAVEL THREAT TO ECONOMY

One of the serious and valid criticisms of the Soviet regime is the lack of freedom for Russians to travel abroad without government approval. How far the United States of America has come miserably down the same objectionable trail of government control is exemplified by the current consideration of travel taxes and restrictions on visits outside this hemisphere.

One provision alone among the new tourist proposals highlights the bureaucratic vise in which the American traveler might soon find himself: Unless he deposits with the government, before he departs, funds sufficient to cover his potential tax indebtedness from his trip abroad, he will not be allowed to leave the country.

Is this the United States, land of the free? Is this typical of the great concept of global freedom and peaceful interchange which this nation so earnestly preaches?

Taxes from 15 to 30 per cent on tourist spending exceeding a pittance of \$7 a day, and a new inflationary 5 per cent tax on overseas fares outside the hemisphere would be punitive. Additionally proposed are excessive reductions in duty-free import privileges and new import taxes. The traveler will find a bureaucratic maze and extra cost sufficient to daunt and deter even the most enthusiastic.

And all this to achieve a doubtful saving of about \$500 million in the payments deficit caused by Administration economic profligacy. Is precious freedom to be so sacrificed on so flimsy a pretext?

The damage may be almost irreparable around the world, as well as domestically. The controls and taxes—like so many before them—could become a permanent infringe-

ment of our rights, notwithstanding promises to the contrary.

Tourists would feel the tax bite on daily spending over \$7, but junketing congressmen receive a \$50 a day allowance, excluding travel. Why?

Ordinary American citizens have no access to the abundance of "counterpart funds" lodged in various countries, but congressional representatives draw on them. Why?

These funds—United States credits in local currencies—are estimated to run into billions. Is it impossible to allow citizens to purchase counterpart funds through American diplomatic offices abroad, thus conserving foreign exchange and obviating the need for tourist taxes?

The adverse effect the President's tax proposals will have on economies around the world will undoubtedly cause repercussions which could well negate any savings.

The proposals show the desperate lack of morality of an administration prepared to meet its irresponsible obligations only through a reckless disregard for economic responsibility.

This is freedom taxed at 15 percent, and therefore devalued.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

THE UN-AMERICAN PLANNING COMMITTEE

For the most part the business community's comments on the new Johnsonian controls have been muted and cautious. Not so with some of the nation's most noted economists; their reactions are outspoken and bitter.

Curiously, perhaps, that criticism comes from both conservatives and liberals, as those labels are loosely used today.

Gottfried Haberler of Harvard writes to the New York Times to denounce the Administration for aping the Schachtian morass of specific controls deployed during the Hitler regime. On this page of this newspaper the other day John Kenneth Galbraith warned of the drastic consequences for businessmen.

The University of Virginia's James Buchanan and Warren Nutter, quoted approving in Clayton Fritchey's column, flail the Administration for erecting an ugly Gold Wall, symbolically similar to the Berlin Wall. (Mr. Fritchey, as it happens, was once a power in the liberal Democratic Truman Administration.)

What unites these men, and accounts for their bitterness, is not alone the economic folly of the President's proposed mandatory controls on foreign investment and travel. It is also that the restrictions are so blatantly un-American.

"To prevent American tourists," writes Professor Haberler, "from going outside the Western Hemisphere is not only a shocking infringement on individual rights, but gives the worst possible example. It flagrantly contradicts the often repeated declarations for freer international trade . . ."

Congress and the voters, aver Professors Buchanan and Nutter, "should not support an Administration that considers individual liberty so trivial that it may be cavalierly sacrificed in a vain effort to maintain wholly arbitrary values of the dollar."

Not that the savants are overlooking the purely economic aspects of the Administration's twisted thinking.

Such controls, in Professor Galbraith's opinion, would undo much of the progress in international economic relations that has been achieved since World War II. And in the following words Professor Haberler gets close to the heart of the economic stupidity:

"General nondiscriminatory payments restrictions could perhaps be justified as a temporary measure if something decisive were done at the same time to correct the fundamental disequilibrium. But nothing of this sort has been proposed. On the contrary, the Federal Reserve continues to pump money

at a record rate into the economy" while the President continually signs into law new programs costing billions of dollars.

Messrs. Buchanan and Nutter charge the Johnson Administration with "having failed all tests of fiscal and monetary responsibility." Mr. Fritchey says a travel tax would not make a serious dent in the 1968 balance-of-payments deficit and inveighs against the restrictive attitude toward foreign investments:

"This, too, is a sham, for the U.S. is now getting back more in profits from investments abroad than it is putting in through fresh capital. In the long run (the Administration's plan) is a self-defeating policy..."

With all of these economic analyses we heartily agree, as the observations in this space have long indicated. Like the critical economists and, we suspect, a great many other Americans, we are also profoundly disturbed by the intimations of totalitarianism so manifest in the Administration's attempt to punish the public for its own egregious shortcomings. The nature of controls is that they bring forth more controls, and it would be a foolish man who would deny that individual freedom is thereby threatened.

As for the business community's seeming reluctance to speak out so far, we suppose that is the more or less traditional stance, and is certainly a businessman's privilege. In the current case, though, the tradition could well be violated, on the grounds that the planners in Washington are playing dangerous games with the economy and simultaneously revealing more clearly than ever their authoritarian political bias.

Reason enough for businessmen to take a cue from our forthright economists. It's no time for anyone who cares about his country to keep quiet.

[From Burbank (Calif.) Daily Review]

TRAVEL TAX TO BRING MOUNTAIN OF REDTAPE
(By Joseph R. Coyne)

WASHINGTON.—Congressional approval of President Johnson's proposed tax on U.S. travelers abroad would create a new mountain of federal red tape.

But the Treasury Department foresees little undue delay for overseas travelers—and few administrative problems for the government—if it gets some 500 additional workers to help handle the program.

As outlined Monday for the House Ways and Means Committee, the proposed travel tax and cuts in duty-free allowances would generate at least another 12 million pieces of paper yearly for the Customs Service and the Internal Revenue Service.

Customs figures it will need another 535 employees throughout the country to handle the increased workload and to tighten the collection of duties it is now missing because it lacks manpower.

There's no estimate as yet of how many additional workers IRS might need although as explained by Treasury experts the travel tax procedures should create no bottleneck at airports or docks.

Most traveling Americans wouldn't be affected by the proposed tax on spending because the Western Hemisphere is exempt. Roughly two-thirds of all U.S. citizens traveling in other countries go to Canada and Mexico.

Treasury officials said they count about 2.2 million taxable trips yearly and this will mean another 6.6 million pieces of paper to be filled out by individuals and handled by IRS.

To comply with the proposed travel tax, a person would be required to file a statement before he leaves the airport listing the amount of money and travelers checks he is carrying with him. He must also file and pay an estimated tax based on the amount he plans to spend abroad.

But Treasury officials said the tax state-

ments can be filled out well in advance of the trip since the forms would be available at post offices and through travel agents. The traveler could merely enclose his check in an envelope to cover his estimated tax and deposit it at the departure point.

A similar declaration of pocket money would be filed on return but this could be completed during the air flight or ship passage home, one official said. It also would be dropped in a basket while the person went through customs.

The returning traveler would then have 60 days to file a travel tax return and pay any additional money owed.

All three forms—the two declarations of money carried by the tourist and the formal tax return itself—would come in one package to be picked up before the trip.

The proposal to reduce duty-free allowances on souvenirs and other goods purchased abroad from \$100 to \$10 would be expected to swell the current number of Customs Service assessments by 1 million to a total 1,350,000 yearly.

This would require another 145 employees at a cost of \$1.5 million, officials said, but would increase federal revenues by about \$17 million.

The cut from \$10 to \$1 in the duty-free allowance for gift packages mailed home would mean another 5 million packages processed, the service said.

Presently, customs makes assessments on about 1.6 million gift packages a year. But because it lacks adequate manpower, an estimated 3.4 million packages go through without being taxed.

To handle this entire load, officials estimate it would take 390 additional workers at a cost of \$3.5 million, but would increase federal customs revenues by \$30 million.

[From the Wisconsin AAA News]

CURB ON TRAVEL

President Johnson's proposal for a voluntary two-year moratorium on travel outside the Western Hemisphere by Americans is unlikely to receive the support of the public or of Congress.

The Wisconsin AAA believes such travel restrictions would have negative effects of far-reaching proportions on the nation's trade and on relationships the U.S. now has with friendly countries. The dollar savings affected, if any, would be minute in the overall balance of payments picture.

All responsible citizens are concerned with the U.S. balance of payments problem and its effect on the stability of the dollar. Few in the travel industry agree with the government's evaluation of the "travel deficit," however. Nor do we believe that tourism should be singled out as the villain of what obviously is a much more complicated problem.

MORE FICTION THAN FACT

The travel deficit is actually more fiction than fact. When we subtract dollars spent in the Western Hemisphere, where we enjoy a favorable balance of payments—dollars spent by businessmen, who are creating new markets for American industry and aiding in the development of countries into which the U.S. is pouring millions and millions of dollars in foreign aid, and money spent with foreign airlines, who return these dollars and many more in the purchase of U.S. aircraft and services—we are facing a "travel deficit" of about \$500 million, spent by "pleasure travelers."

But even "pleasure travel" is a deceiving term. Does it include teachers and students who are broadening their education? Does it include thousands of good-will ambassadors who are teaching the world what America is really like? Does it include religious pilgrims and other special interest groups who are strengthening spiritual and cultural ties with our neighbors on this ever-shrinking globe?

CONSTRUCTIVE APPROACH

The Wisconsin AAA believes a constructive approach to this problem is far better than any restrictions on travel.

The AAA has always supported the principle of freedom to travel as a basic right of all free people. Through the years the AAA has been active in encouraging governments to reduce all travel barriers to a minimum. And, of course, the AAA has helped millions to enjoy the benefits of travel.

AAA personnel are serving on four working committees of the President's special Task Force on travel to help find creative answers to the travel deficit. The AAA is also participating with other members of the travel industry in the development of programs to stimulate more travel to and within the U.S.

The Wisconsin AAA believes these efforts will help to minimize the possibility of restrictions on foreign travel to which all U.S. citizens have an inherent right as members of a free society.

THE TAX ON FOREIGN TRAVEL WON'T SOLVE ANYONE'S PROBLEM

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—Cumbbersome, regressive, awkward, unenforceable—these are the more polite denunciations of President Johnson's proposed tax on travel. Whether Congress will adopt the levy in the form put forward by the Treasury is questionable.

In Western Europe this is not an academic question. For a half-dozen countries the tourist dollar supplies the margin of essential foreign exchange. What is more, if American travel outside the Hemisphere is substantially cut back the recession that has slowed economic growth in Europe will in all probability be accentuated.

RETALIATION IS POSSIBLE

Economists are fearful that it will bring reprisals, hastening a trend already evident toward the kind of tariff walls and a struggle for national self-sufficiency that spelled disaster in the early thirties. In some instances—France is one—the United States has a favorable trade balance offset in part by the spending of the American tourist.

Italy in 1966 had a favorable tourist balance of \$1.199 billion. This represents the total spent by foreign tourists over and above the amount of spending by Italian travelers abroad. For Austria the figure was \$420 million; for Greece, \$102 million; for Portugal, \$178 million. The figures come from the report on tourism by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. In each country the tourist supplies the difference between a favorable trade picture and the ability to import necessities and belt tightening checking the flow of imports.

Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler had hardly finished reading his lengthy statement on travel taxes to the House Ways and Means Committee before members of Congress were raising doubts about countries that should be exempted. What about Ireland? Thousands of Irish-Americans go back to the old sod each year. Ireland's favorable travel balance was \$84 million in 1966. And what of Israel? American Jews with a deep loyalty to what ardent Zionists consider the Jewish homeland make the pilgrimage year after year.

In 1966, according to Commerce Department figures, a trip to Europe cost American travelers on the average \$1,070. The average stay in Europe was 37 days. Since then prices have risen sharply. Fowler gave the example of a traveler abroad for 30 days spending \$700 apart from the cost of air or steamship fare. He would be taxed \$110, and if his round-trip fare was an additional \$400 the transportation tax would be \$20 for a total bill from Uncle Sam of \$130. How much this would deter the average traveler must be a guess.

NEW PROBLEMS ARISE

The impact on those countries that rely on tourism will be not only in the travel tax. The Treasury package calls for reducing the present duty exemption of \$100 to \$10 and cutting the current \$10 duty-free gift mailed back home to \$1. This means that Aunt Minnie and the schoolteacher from Wichita will think twice before buying knickknacks at the foot of the Spanish steps in Rome.

The threat as the last session of Congress ended was a wave of import quotas on major competitive imports. A gathering momentum for stay-at-home protectionism is hardly the way to solve the world's problems.

TRAVEL GAP FIGURES ARE NOT EXACTLY RIGHT
(By Jerry Flemmons)

Uh-huh, Mr. President. The travel gap is not that wide. In truth, there is no gap at all.

Any so-called head tax on overseas travelers of \$50 or \$100 or, alternately, \$5 or \$6 daily, would be penny-foolish. Realistically America would not gain a cent in the gold flow and probably would lose considerable ground.

Travel simply is not to blame for the deficit. Whoever figured travel's involvement in the balance of payments crisis did not see the full picture, and, whether deliberately or not, he has only succeeded in widening the credibility between government and the people.

The travel deficit made public was quoted as \$1.9 billion. That is misleading.

Of that total, \$570 million went for transportation. Travel in Canada and Mexico (which would be excluded from any ban) accounted for another \$435 million. Travel outside the European and Mediterranean areas—this too, would be excluded—is \$135 million.

The remaining total is \$755 million, but \$392 million of that was for non-pleasure travel and should a ban be instituted, business, educational and scientific travel would not be taxed.

So, if the accountant were honest he would have said only \$363 million—not \$1.9 billion—was the travel deficit.

But a ban on travel—or a head tax—would eliminate incomes which today make that so-called \$363 million deficit almost nonexistent.

For example, foreign airlines, government tourism departments and the like spent \$203 million in the United States for staff, advertising, airport charges and communications. And, more than \$127 million was earned in 1966 by American domestic airlines from passengers who flew from their home cities to connect with cross-Atlantic flights.

That—adding the 8 per cent increase experienced by airlines last year—totals about \$356 million. Now, the deficit is only \$7 million.

To get into the plus column, all that is necessary is to add the money value of aircraft purchased in the United States by foreign airlines. In 1966 that was \$224 million worth.

OK, now the deficit is a definite surplus. Playing the numbers game with travel figures is a silly pastime. The government is wrong in its computations, whether intentionally or not. But the money is not important, the principle is.

The American right to travel is, if not inherent, at least strongly traditional and not something with which to play hanky-panky.

If a citizen is not a criminal his right to freedom of movement is his. It simply is not the business of government to meddle in his travel plans, either by restriction or tax.

A tax would be harmful not to the rich—what's \$50 to a tycoon?—but to the middle-class traveler, that segment of population which supports the tourism industry, and tourism, at last count, was America's third-largest business.

See America First. Sure, everyone should,

but the government won't force Americans to open their eyes to our natural beauties by placing an unnecessary ban on foreign travel.

Even Congress is not convinced of a need for overseas travel bans. One congressman said this week that he would prefer for America to take a more positive approach, such as promoting more Europeans into the United States.

This seems to be the feeling almost everywhere—except within the federal government. There is a United States Travel Service, charged with bringing tourists to America.

But the government pays only tight-lip service to the office. Barely \$3 million was given it last year to spend on its promotions.

At least four states have larger tourism budgets. The government spends more than \$3 million yearly on lightbulbs.

Travel, if not the ultimate answer, is at least a hope for a saner world. When it is discovered that the Russian shopkeeper shrugs his shoulders with the same movement as a rancher from Midland or that both gripe about taxes with identical furies, then perhaps nations and peoples will not feel so strange with one another.

Misinformation from the government is not new and it never is well-taken by the public. The facts are, regardless of what the Washington figure may say, that travel is not to blame for the deficit.

Travel, in fact, is more to be praised than scorned, and somebody in Washington should shout that about.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times]

EUROPE: L. B. J.'S WAY

(By Jerry Hulse)

Arthur Frommer has insisted all along that you can do Europe on \$5 a day, but no one really took him seriously.

I mean, how many American tourists want to hitchhike or ride a bicycle and live it up in a youth hostel?

Well, that other great world traveler, Lyndon B. Johnson, is rewriting the whole episode.

He's calling his guide "Europe on \$10 a day."

This is the sum the man in the White House will propose that Americans be allowed to spend before getting the tax hook, sources say.

Returning to Frommer for a minute, he was pitching "Europe on \$5 a Day" years ago. Today it would take \$10 to accomplish the same thing.

ADVICE UPDATED

In other words, L.B.J. has merely updated Frommer's advice to travel-hungry Americans and pitched it under a new cover.

The word came down from the White House this week. The President will ask Congress to enact a series of tax steps to curb overseas travel.

His recommendations will probably be offered to the House Ways and Means Committee on Monday.

Here is what is being considered, according to Washington sources: (1) the \$10 ceiling on spending (2) a tax on overseas airline tickets, (3) a cutback in the \$100 duty-free allowance for purchases.

Anyone spending more than \$10 a day would be taxed.

The obvious intention is to allow students, teachers and others travelling on a budget to continue on their way. That is, if they can survive on \$10 a day.

There is a quick formula for doing Europe on \$10 a day.

The best advice is not to eat. Have your continental breakfast (usually it goes with your room) and then simply swallow a diet pill.

You cannot travel in Europe with an appetite. Not on \$10 a day.

It is entirely possible that people like Mr.

Hilton will close up shop and go home. On \$10 a day his guests could afford only a sneak snooze in the lobby.

CASE OF GIGGLES

What gave everyone a case of the giggles is that L.B.J. obviously believes Europe on \$10 a Day will discourage the jet set.

This, of course, is ludicrous. The jetsetters are loaded and while a tax will prove irritating, it certainly won't dissuade them from casting off for Marrakech or other exotic targets.

There's even talk of a maximum ceiling on tourist spending. That is, you'd be taxed for anything above \$10 until you reach a certain ceiling.

But how would the government keep tabs on spending?

One source said Americans would be asked to report their travel spurring to customs officers at their home port.

Another said Americans might be told to report their trip expenses on their federal income tax statements.

This caused a few chuckles around the country. How many high rollers ever copped out to their winnings in Las Vegas?

"How do you enforce it?" asked a government friend in Washington this week. "Do you ask every hotel in Europe to send along a statement to the Internal Revenue Service?"

It was obvious in his State of the Union Message that L.B.J. was going to rewrite the Frommer message—that is, the \$5 a day bit.

SOME EXCEPTIONS

He spoke of still allowing "teachers, business people, students and Americans who have relatives abroad" to travel to Europe.

This has inspired a friend of mine to consider settling in Europe and setting up a new business. He plans to call it "Rent-A-Cousin, Inc."

In other words, if you're not a teacher, a businessman, a student or someone with a relative—he'll rent you a cousin.

This way you'll still be able to go to Europe without suffering the fate of the ordinary tourist.

It could be a lucrative business.

Besides those restrictions already discussed, Americans will probably be forbidden to mail home duty-free gifts.

Presently one may send \$10 worth of gifts through the mail. This has nothing to do with the \$100 duty-free allowance, which involves a loot a tourist hand-carries back to the United States.

In case your travel plans are up in the air because of all the fuss, come back to earth.

SUGGESTIONS PLANNED

Sources say the administration plans only to make suggestions to Congress. And there's been plenty of heat by the opposition.

Bert Hemphill, who holds the title of the "world's most traveled man," predicts that Congress may agree to a 10% transportation tax and elimination of the \$100 duty-free allowance, but that's all.

Hemphill reminded unhappy American travelers that a \$5 head tax was imposed on everyone who went out of the country between World Wars I and II.

After World II it was raised to 15% and then cut to 10% and finally eliminated. Everyone still traveled.

Meanwhile, John Black, who heads up the U.S. Travel Service, wasn't in his office "when I called this week."

"He left this morning for Europe," his assistant said.

[From the London Economist, Jan. 20, 1968]

YANKS STAY HOME

"It is important to the country that every citizen reassess his travel plans and not travel outside this hemisphere except under the most important, urgent and necessary conditions," said President Johnson in his mes-

sage on the balance of international payments on New Year's Day. In addition, the President said that he might ask Congress to back up this urgent need to restrict tourist travel abroad with legislation that could, for the first time in the history of the United States, penalize a citizen who insisted on taking his holiday overseas. This voluntary appeal and the law, if one is requested, are intended to cut as least \$500 million from the so-called "travel gap"—the difference between spending by Americans who go abroad and spending by overseas visitors in the United States—which, the President estimated, would reach \$2 billion this year.

In 1966 almost 3 million Americans went abroad and only just over 1 million foreigners came to the United States. This was, however, a gain of 12 percent over the previous year and the improvement in 1967 was even greater. The President is asking for a speedier report from his special task force, set up earlier under Mr. McKinney, to advise him on methods of bringing more visitors to the United States. This is still apparently to be the group's main work but in the changed circumstances it can hardly ignore the other side of the travel gap.

The reaction of the American airline and travel industry to the President's announcement was opportunistic to a degree. Trans World Airlines hastily put out widely quoted advertisements which featured an illustration of a gold ingot, saying "there are only two ways to keep in it the United States when you fly to Europe: TWA or our friends at Pan American." The American Express Company, the travel agency whose shares had broken badly following the President's statement, rushed into print with a booklet attacking the government's figures. This was distributed to the 4,000 members of the American Society of Travel Agents as an analysis of the "true nature" of the travel gap. "It is important that we do not panic," ASTA told its members. The truth is, said the American Express, that the gap amounts to a mere \$363 million, if only pleasure trips to the European and Mediterranean countries are considered.

Congressional reaction has been nearly as extreme. Senator Vance Hartke, Democrat of Indiana, accused the President of attempting to restrict the civil rights of American citizens in his efforts to limit the dollar drain. Representative Henry Reuss, also a Democrat, introduced a Bill to create a government travel trade stamp, to be distributed free to people who were visiting the United States for the first time. Each traveller would get \$100 in such stamps and airlines, hotels, railways and car rental companies and other firms catering to visitors could redeem the stamps at the United States Treasury at half value. Most Congressmen have adopted a wait-and-see attitude, preferring to delay until specific proposals have been outlined. It is suggested that the Administration intends to submit various alternatives and let the congressional committees choose. What is expected is some form of tax on travel abroad, either on a *per diem* basis or on total spending; the President has promised that "teachers, business people, students and Americans who have relatives abroad" will not be unduly penalized. But Mr. Mansfield, the Democratic leader in the Senate, doubts whether Congress would pass such a levy.

It remained for General Eisenhower to put the problem in perspective. He said that the solution lay in "self-discipline." Tourists should not go to Europe in the first place, nor should dollars be spent on goods made in Europe: "If I could afford a Rolls-Royce this year, I would not buy one, not now."

HOW WOULD RESTRICTIONS AFFECT AMERICAN TOURISTS?

(By Richard Joseph)

Let's assume for the moment that President Johnson is able to push through his

new Monroe Doctrine for the American tourist—restricting him to travel in the Western Hemisphere—and it's an assumption that grows siffer with each passing day), then what will the tourist's world look like, what places will still be open to him?

First thing to do is to look at the exceptions. Certainly Guam and Samoa will still be open to tourism; they're American islands, within the dollar area, and Washington has been trying to promote pleasure travel there.

Same with the islands of the Pacific Trust Territory, small pieces of Micronesia replete with World War II memories, places with names like Kwajalein, Eniwetok, Truk, Saipan, and Yap, stretching over 2,500 miles of Pacific ocean clear over to within a couple of hundred miles of the Philippines.

This is still unspoiled South Pacific Ball H'ail—even though it's actually in the North Pacific—It's under the American flag and operating under the dollar economy. Recently the civil aeronautics board granted Air Micronesia, owned jointly by Continental Airlines, Hawaii's Aloha Airlines, and a Micronesian company, permission to fly regular service among the major islands.

Included in the deal was the newly formed air lines' agreement to build hotels of 25 rooms each at six main destinations.

Certainly Hawaii, together with Alaska and all other domestic tourist areas, would get a tremendous lift from the Johnson travel ban—with an extra plus for Hawaii as the gateway to the American Pacific.

Mexico, which very possibly offers more varied attractions for more different types of tourist tastes than any other place on earth, might very well be discovered by some supposedly sophisticated travelers who have neglected it thus far because it's so close and so easy to get to.

But our Mexican friends would just as soon be discovered well before or comfortably after this October, when they'll be up to their nervous breakdowns in the Olympics.

From Mexico to Panama there's a whole Terra incognita for the American pleasure traveler—the five Central American republics of Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, and Costa Rica, plus British Honduras.

But this Terra has remained incognita for a very good reason: except for Guatemala it has done nothing to promote tourism; and except for Guatemala and possibly Costa Rica it has done little or nothing to develop its visitor facilities.

As to whether or not it will do anything in the future—with the help of the Johnson travel doctrine and the prodding of the Alliance for Progress—your guess is as good as mine.

The same can be said, to some degree at least, about the South American continent: the republics of Colombia, Venezuela, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Bolivia, Peru, and Ecuador; plus British Guiana, Surinam, and French Guiana. Except for Colombia, Venezuela and Surinam, they're nowhere in their tourist development.

Bermuda, 700 miles out in the Atlantic, is still in the Western Hemisphere; and so, obviously are the Bahamas and all the West Indies.

I've saved Canada for last, because I think it will reap a unique benefit from the Johnson plan, if it is activated. A few more summer sportsmen and family vacationists and winter sports fans will probably go there, but that's not what I'm talking about.

Any oldsters in the audience will remember the boom Canada enjoyed together with the Bahamas as a result of American Prohibition.

"Goodbye Broadway, Hello Montreal!" was a popular song when Prohibition was first enacted and people rushed up there to slake their thirsts. But then it became a lot easier just to buy Canadian booze imported by your friendly local bootlegger.

Prohibition, Americans were told, was good for their physical and moral health; this

time the travel ban is being advanced as a cure for our financial illness—and I just have the feeling that the average American reaction will be similar to any infringement of their personal freedom, no matter how good it might be for them.

When a \$100 exit tax was first bruited about a couple of years ago, it touched of a major European travel boom. And, as James Reston pointed out a day or so after Johnson proposed the new travel restrictions, what's to prevent a Europe-bound traveler from going to Montreal and then grabbing a trans-Atlantic plane there?

Travel to Canada is and will be unrestricted, and no passport is necessary. So your L.B.J.-defying traveler would just keep his passport in his pocket when he crossed into Canada. And after he used his passport for his European trip, and his return to Canada, he'd just keep it under wraps again when he crossed the United States border.

How is this guy to be nailed with a *per diem* tax for every day he's in proscribed areas, when as far as anyone can tell he's been in Canada all the time?

Canadian authorities snitch to Washington? Well, maybe; but those Canadians don't enjoy stooging for anybody, especially when they would be blowing the whistle on a man spending money in their country, and like flying Air Canada or Canadian Pacific to Europe.

Of course he could board Air France, Alitalia, or Lufthansa, KLM, or lots of other airlines in Canada. Almost any of them, in fact, except Pan Am or T.W.A., whose take goes into the American economy.

And while we're on that subject, much of the travel to the Caribbean is on cruise ships, very few of which fly the American flag. If spending in European countries is to be discouraged, will spending on European ships still be O.K.?

Which brings up another point. L.B.J. doesn't want us to go to England or Holland, but we can go to the British Bermuda and the Bahamas, the British West Indies and the Dutch West Indies.

PENALTIES FOR TRAVEL?

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

BERNE.—The great events in the Far East naturally dominate the news in Europe but there is concerning them a spirit of fatalism, which is not freighted with anti-American odium. Too many European powers, too recently, have been too overwhelmed by events to bring them to share America's innocent faith in the efficacy of the national will. France lost Indochina and then Algeria. And for that matter, France lost France, twice in 70 years. One half of Germany is still subjected, 23 years after the death of Hitler. The sun has permanently set on the British Empire.

So there is an undercurrent of sympathy; but none at all concerning President Johnson's unfolding program for preventing Americans from coming to Europe. The meanness of his proposals and the sheer indignity of their enforcement may very well be costing American prestige more among the people of Europe than the reversals in the Far East.

There are, to begin with, the philosophical contradictions. For years and years we have been saying at every opportunity that the peoples of the world should get to know each other better. We have had People-to-People, English-speaking unions, cultural exchanges, Fulbright scholarships: travel has become a part of the ethos. Suddenly, the U.S. announces, at one and the same time, that (a) Americans should stop traveling to Europe; and (b) that Europeans should increase their travel to America.

The sheer psychological inanity of the twin statements is itself arresting. Europeans have their pride. Why should they invest their savings in travel to a country

which proposes to punish those of its citizens who wish to travel in Europe?

And what is a European to think about a country like the U.S. whose citizens permit their government to inflict such a humiliation upon them? It isn't as though Americans were Englishmen, who officially gave up pride when the queue became nationalized after the Second World War.

America has a gross national income which in a few years will amount to a trillion dollars. It is proposed to deprive Americans of a part of their independence—to travel unencumbered—in order to save \$500,000,000 that would otherwise be spent abroad.

A nation which accepts such humiliations for such very low stakes is not one which remains sensible to the joinder work of liberty. If the U.S. can tax overseas travel, it can in effect forbid overseas travel. And the complications inherent in such a law should at least double the size of the income tax form, causing it to resemble an application form for work in the CIA, or that blue monster of the Census Bureau which demands to know how many toilets you have.

The Europeans say it's protectionism, and to hell with it. They are dead right, that is exactly what it is. Once again, the Johnson schizophrenia: lower tariffs and tax travel. The Europeans, to be sure, live in glass houses. But the U.S. is supposed to act bigger than most European nations do. Granted our size, our strength, our traditions, it is we who should be taking the initiative in reducing tariff barriers, in fortifying our freedoms. But Mr. Smoot-Hawley in the White House, who has gotten terribly accustomed to telling people what to do, is now prepared to repeal, by other means, what progress we have made in lowering tariff barriers.

Last week the British Broadcasting Company denied to an American tenor, Mr. Richard Cassilly, a role in "Aida," on the grounds that, sniff, there were plenty of qualified British tenors. That, in the land that suckled Adam Smith! Once again, perhaps one can say concerning England that she has no alternative (though in fact, she has). But concerning America? The national copper strike cost America more dollars used to buy foreign copper than will be saved under the pending act of tyranny. But will President Johnson propose a reform denying to labor unions the right to strike an entire industry?

Well, the proposed act has not yet passed in Congress. We shall have to see how it is handled there. In Europe, it is automatically assumed that anything President Johnson desires, he gets from his Congress. The Europeans are too nearly right for comfort.

[From the Glendale (Calif.) News-Press]

TAX ON TRAVEL ECONOMY THREAT

One of the serious and valid criticisms of the Soviet regime is the lack of freedom for Russians to travel abroad without government approval. How far the United States of America has come miserably down the same objectionable trail of government control is exemplified by the current consideration of travel taxes and restrictions on visits outside this hemisphere.

One provision alone among the new tourist proposals highlights the bureaucratic vise in which the American traveler might soon find himself: Unless he deposits with the government, before he departs, funds sufficient to cover his potential tax indebtedness from his trip abroad, he will not be allowed to leave the country.

Is this the United States, land of the free? Is this typical of the great concept of global freedom and peaceful interchange which this nation so earnestly preaches?

Taxes from 15 to 30 per cent on tourist spending exceeding a pittance of \$7 a day, and a new inflationary 5 per cent tap on overseas fares outside the hemisphere would be punitive. Additionally proposed are excessive reductions in duty-free import privileges and

new import taxes. The traveler will find a bureaucratic maze and extra cost sufficient to daunt and deter even the most enthusiastic.

And all this to achieve a doubtful saving of about \$500 million in the payments deficit caused by Administration economic profligacy. Is precious freedom to be so sacrificed on so flimsy a pretext?

The damage may be almost irreparable around the world, as would as domestically: The controls and taxes—like so many before them—could become a permanent infringement of our rights, notwithstanding promises to the contrary.

Tourists would feel the tax bite on daily spending over \$7, but junketing congressmen receive a \$50 a day allowance, excluding travel. Why?

Ordinary American citizens have no access to the abundance of "counterpart funds" lodged in various countries, but congressional representatives draw on them. Why?

These funds—United States credits in local currencies—are estimated to run into billions. Is it impossible to allow citizens to purchase counterpart funds through American diplomatic offices abroad, thus conserving foreign exchange and obviating the need for tourist taxes?

The adverse effect the President's tax proposals will have on economies around the world will undoubtedly cause repercussions which could well negate any savings.

The proposals show the desperate lack of morality of an administration prepared to meet its irresponsible obligations only through a reckless disregard for economic responsibility.

This is freedom taxed at 15 per cent, and therefore devalued.

TRAVEL TAX A BERLIN WALL

(By John Chamberlain)

Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler is a dreamer if he thinks for one moment that the gimmicky plan to tax free-born American citizens on travel expenses in Europe and Asia will ever pass the U.S. Congress. Senators are already talking about Dr. Fowler and his Band-Aid prescriptions.

Surely the Fowler idea is the maddest infringement of personal liberty that has ever been proposed. Some people like to drink coffee, tea or cocoa; some people like to travel. They all cost dollars that go for foreign exchange. Yet, arbitrarily, the administration would permit the tea drinker his Ceylon or Oolong brew, but the traveler is to be penalized if he spends more than \$7 a day in foreign living. The dollars that would be kept at home by making travel difficult might add up to \$300-million a year. But the savings would be more than erased by the ill-will of foreigners who would quite properly resent the fall-off in tourist revenues caused by the new U.S. isolationism.

If Fowler has his way, cities like Seattle will suffer from the cancellation of foreign orders for jet aircraft; Pan American World Airways will lose money on its Inter-Continental Hotels; TWA's Hilton affiliate will have empty rooms; American travel agents will find they can't scrounge up a compensating surge of east-to-west French and Norwegian trippers; organizations such as the American Field Service which send students abroad will be severely hurt in their budgets by the five per cent air travel tax, and President Charles de Gaulle of France, who is reportedly recovering from being run down by a motorboat (sic) while out walking will be figuring out ways of hitting American exporters in revenge for what has been done to Montmartre night spots and restaurants on the Left Bank.

The dollar losses that would develop from foreign reprisals, however, would be less damaging than the damage done to the American psyche. Sen. Vance Hartke of Indiana put it forcefully the other day when

he said that from the earliest days of the republic Americans have flexed their muscles, puffed out their chests, and sailed to the far places of the world. Indonesia was once known in Massachusetts as the "Salem Indies." Stephen Girard of Philadelphia wouldn't have gone into the banking business if he hadn't made money out of the China trade.

It was in the middle of the Indian Ocean that Sam Colt got his idea for the revolving cartridge chamber; he happened to be watching the helmsman's wheel spin over and catch when a spoke came into lie with the desired shift in the ships direction.

The U.S., thanks to its "internationalists" of the Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt generations that nurtured President Lyndon Johnson and Secretary of the Treasury Fowler, has inherited a certain responsibility for the safety of the outside world. My own generation, which grew up in the inter-war period, always resented Walter Lippmann for insisting that the U.S. was the new Rome, but, after World War II, we bowed to the newer realities of the intercontinental missile and the atom bomb. (At this point Lippmann deserted us.)

It is indeed passing strange for the administration to tell us at this late stage that Americans must refrain from learning about the outer world at the very time they are being asked to carry much of that world on their shoulders. Isolationism just won't mix with the development of Camranh Bay, or the need to keep a U.S. fleet in the Mediterranean. If we can't travel in Europe and Asia, why bother to save them? Why bother to teach French and German in our schools? Why bother to put up billions for supersonic planes? Why have exchange programs.

It wasn't so many months ago that the President, in his Smithsonian speech, was expatiating on the desirability of expanding those cultural contacts with other countries. What has happened to this Lyndon Johnson? We have always derided nations which have tried to lock their people in. It would surely keep a computer going for weeks to count the sarcastic words written about the Berlin Wall, and the reliance of the Soviets on barbed wire. Yet now, in a slightly sophisticated form, we are proposing to build our own Berlin Wall.

I'm ashamed for my country, that's what I am. But surely, Congress won't let Fowler's Folly become law.

[From the Bristol (Conn.) Press, Feb. 6, 1968]

AN ASININE PROPOSAL

Of all of the proposals to raise revenue and cut down the balance of payments deficit, the administration plan for taxing travel abroad is about as idiotic as any ever offered.

The proposal, in brief, is to levy a tax on all expenditures over \$7 a day. The levy would be 15 per cent on the first \$8 over the exempt \$7 and 30 per cent on the remainder of the excess. Custom free purchases would be restricted and an excise tax of 5 per cent would be levied on air and water transportation outside the Western Hemisphere.

It might be noted parenthetically that the government now allows senators and congressmen \$50 a day for "inspection" trips abroad.

Treasury Secretary Fowler has presented the proposition to the House Ways and Means Committee. We trust that Chairman Wilbur Mills will reject it forthwith.

Will the secretary please tell us how in the world the government is going to determine whether a traveler spent more than \$7 a day when the loopholes in the scheme are so obvious that an eighth grade schoolboy can see them?

And, if the plan (God forbid) ever goes through, who is going to do the checking on the returning traveler? Won't the federal government have to hire several hundred more agents to handle the volume, thus de-

feating the whole purpose of the tax in the first place?

Did it ever occur to Secretary Fowler that there are any number of credit cards in use which are good all over the world? Holders can use these cards as authentication and cashing of personal checks.

What's the matter with taking a trip to Canada and thence to Europe?

Better than that, let's not go to Europe at all this year. We can go to Nassau or Bermuda, or any of the Caribbean islands which are under foreign flags, spend all we wish without having to report. Of course it will still contribute to the dollar drain but it will free us from restrictions of which we already have too many.

How about the brass ring for Treasury Secretary Fowler for the fuzziest thinker of the week?

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review, Feb. 7, 1968]

TRAVEL TAX PLAN COSTLY, COMPLEX

A crew of workers in the U.S. Treasury Department must have spent many days figuring out the complicated formulas under which the government expects to collect special travel taxes in order to curtail the personal spending of American tourists abroad.

The plan, as proposed to Congress by Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler, is one device designed to reduce America's balance-of-payments deficit. Its main purpose is to penalize individuals who spend more than \$7 a day while traveling outside the Western Hemisphere.

The manner in which it would have to be administered would call for advance estimates of amounts to be spent, a cash deposit by the traveler to cover what he might expect to owe, and other forms to fill out upon his return.

Naturally, in the enforcement of such new travel controls, the government would have to build up its tax-collection bureaucracy, be on the lookout for possible cheaters and become a prime heckler of the travel agencies and transportation companies.

It is quite possible that the revenue derived and the travel curbs that would be established would not be worth the total cost of operating the scheme.

It is notable that persons traveling in behalf of the government itself would be exempt. This could mean more federal junkets abroad at taxpayer expense and far fewer trips by modest-income citizens who pay their own way.

The proposed Johnson travel tax certainly should get a thorough going-over by the House Ways and Means Committee.

[From Fortune]

THE "UNCONGENIAL" PACKAGE

Since there is nothing to see in the U.S. except "little towns with front porches," Mrs. Robert McCormick, widow to the late great Colonel, has let it be known that she expects to travel to Europe in any case. Mrs. Sidney Zlotnick, wife of a wealthy Washington, D.C., businessman, has allowed, "If you can't have the comfort and luxury you have at home, why go?" and may cancel plans to visit North Africa. Somewhere between these two extremes is a wealthy foreign-service officer who states that he is going to Paris as usual but by way of concession may give up collecting Impressionists "until the crisis is over."

Secretary of the Treasury Fowler can no doubt survive any one of those three contingencies in fighting for what he himself calls an "uncongenial" package of controls on American travel outside the hemisphere. But Congress may be his undoing. In effect, what the Administration is proposing is three different kinds of measures. The first is a straight 5 percent excise tax on airline and

ship tickets corresponding to a similar tax on airline domestic travel. The second is a sharp reduction from \$100 to \$10 of the goods that Americans can bring home duty free. The third—and the one that has occasioned most of the firing—is a new travel tax on overseas expenditures. Under the Treasury plan, the tourist could make tax-free expenditures only up to \$7 per day. Between \$7 and \$15 per day the tax will be 15 percent, and above that the rate would go up to 30 percent.

This kind of tax not only breaks new legislative ground but is, of course, highly discriminatory. The objective, according to one Treasury expert, is "to get the biggest balance-of-payments kicks possible while giving the lower-income groups the biggest possible break." So the low-income school-teacher who can sight-see Europe on \$12 to \$15 per day may not pay much over \$1 per day. The tax on the jet-set traveler will be much larger. In between, the man or woman who spends \$25 per day will face a daily tax of \$4 to \$5. As the Secretary sees it, all this adds up to a spending deterrent that would cut around \$250 million from the expected travel deficit of nearly \$2 billion.

One wonders how many millions it will cost to get that \$250 million. Fowler's bill would require each traveler to open his wallet to tax men as he departs, declaring the amount of cash and traveler's checks he is taking with him. Then the tourist would fill out preliminary estimates of how much he intends to spend abroad. Within sixty days after his return, he would have to file a second return on his actual expenditures and pay up whatever additional tax is due. There's a penalty of 10 percent for any underestimate of more than 20 percent. And the whole thing is subject to audit, along with the personal income tax, by the Internal Revenue Service.

In the present circumstances, there is some logic to the 5 percent excise tax on plane tickets and to the curtailment of duty-free "carry home" privileges. But about the only thing to be said for the spending-control provisions is that they are so onerous they may prompt a public outcry for an end to big fiscal deficits and loose monetary policies, which are the root cause of our problem abroad. In effect, the multiplication of controls means embracing not one but several exchange rates on the American dollar—one for tourists, one for capital transfers (under different controls already in effect), and one for other transactions. The fact that these restrictions are presented singly, to meet this "emergency" and then that one, hardly obscures the fact that we are gradually throttling the system of international payments on which all the world's recent development has been built.

[From the New York Times]

Y'ALL COME

President Johnson's special task force on travel has come up with a proposal everyone can applaud for closing the "tourist gap" and easing the balance of payments problem it creates. The plan's goal is to encourage more foreigners to visit the United States. The President has helped out by his request to Congress to relax visa requirements for certain friendly countries. That provides a needed follow-up to the task force's announcement of action by several international airlines to lower trans-Atlantic fares from abroad. Parallel action is being taken by American airlines to cut domestic fares in half for foreigners traveling in this country. Rental cars, trains, buses, hotels and motels are also offering foreigners reductions in their normal charges.

Obviously this approach is much more palatable than the complicated schedule of taxes the Administration seeks to impose on Americans traveling abroad. These represent a wholly negative response to the balance-of-

payments problem. They would restrict the freedom to travel, be difficult to collect and, in considerable measure, fall on those least able to afford them, especially students, teachers and lower-income families eager to visit relatives overseas.

The task force report offers a positive alternative. Income levels in foreign nations fall generally below those in this country and the sheer cost of visiting the United States has doubtless kept many foreigners away. There are still other things the President could ask Congress to do by way of making it easier for foreigners to come here. Specifically, restrictions on Iron Curtain scientists visiting this nation could be eased to permit the holding of important international scientific conventions in this country. As it is, these conventions go elsewhere to avoid embarrassment to distinguished participants.

Instead of raising new barriers for Americans wishing to travel abroad, it would be wise to lower old barriers that prevent foreigners from coming here.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times]

TRAVEL TAX A BAD IDEA

President Johnson's proposed tax on travel outside the Western Hemisphere is unfair, costly and could be harmful to international relations.

The objective of the tax is to reduce by 10 per cent the estimated \$2 billion difference between what Americans spend abroad and what is spent here by foreign travelers.

The tax will deal a heavy blow to American industry and business. The travel industry and all the businesses and industries that serve it will lose income—and thus will pay less taxes. There would be an increase in unemployment figures as a result.

The proposed rule that travelers must declare how much money they are carrying, and be checked, even searched to see if they are honest, is demeaning.

It is a fact, also, that travel abroad is a contributing factor to world peace. The more Americans and people of other nations come to know each other the less chance there is for trouble arising out of misunderstanding and misinformation.

There are many other ways by which the administration could reduce its balance of payments deficit. The General Accounting Office pointed this out in October, in a detailed report of how the application of common sense and sound fiscal policies could sharply reduce or wipe out the deficit.

Or the administration could, by judicious paring, save 10 per cent of the \$2.9 billion it will spend overseas for non-Vietnam military needs.

As experienced travel experts point out, the proposed travel tax would "encourage more cheating than prohibition did. The seasoned traveler will be able to evade the tax with ease. The only ones that would suffer would be the unsophisticated travelers, and that is most unfair."

The proposed tax on what travelers spend abroad is a bad idea. Congress should reject it.

[From the Washington Post]

AN INAUSPICIOUS BEGINNING

President Johnson's "Message to the Nation on the Balance of Payments" is an inauspicious beginning for the new year. It poses a threat to the freedom of Americans to travel outside of this hemisphere. It invokes emergency powers, originally granted to the Executive in 1917, in order to place mandatory controls both on the volume of direct foreign investment and on the particular countries to which it flows. It compels the foreign affiliates of American enterprises to repatriate specified proportions of their earnings at the end of each year. And it outlines an export drive which, in view of this country's already large balance-of-trade-sur-

plus, could invite retaliation in the shape of restrictions by other countries.

Even if the effectiveness of these neo-mercantilist infringements upon the international movement of people and capital was assured, the loss of freedom would be too high a price to pay for the preservation of the system of fixed exchange rates and a dollar price for gold that is pegged at an artificially low level. But there is no reason to suppose this recourse to more stringent controls will strengthen the position of the dollar. They are more likely than not to be counterproductive, to disrupt the international monetary system by stanching the outflow of dollars and to depress income and employment in many countries of the world by sharply reducing the volume of direct foreign investment.

The President said that our travel deficit will exceed \$2 billion this year, and he asked "the American people to defer for the next two years all nonessential travel outside the Western Hemisphere." The Secretary of the Treasury will "explore with the appropriate Congressional committees legislation to help achieve this objective."

What the President did not say was that the \$2 billion tourist deficit was greatly swollen last year by the Expo 67 fair in Montreal. But the principle at issue runs far deeper than any balance-of-payments arithmetic. What is the point of achieving a stronger dollar if the right of Americans to travel abroad is to be abridged? That right is enjoyed by the citizens of the most poverty-stricken, inflation-ridden countries on earth. It must never be denied the citizens of the world's wealthiest country. And the Congress that accedes to the President's request—assuming that this is not just a hortatory exercise—might well find itself repudiated by the electorate.

The President in his formal message and Treasury Secretary Fowler in his press conferences remarks expressed the hope that these new restrictions, by diminishing the dollar outflow and reducing monetary reserves, will induce other countries to approve and activate the now pending plan for international monetary reform. But their strategy entails an enormous risk.

The announced goal of the new program is to reduce the U.S. deficit by \$3 billion in 1968. But even if they are successful in reducing it by \$2 billion, the prospects for filling the monetary reserve gap with the new Special Drawing Rights on the International Monetary Fund are dim. The most optimistic appraisals call for creating \$1 billion of SDRs a year. Hence, to the extent that this program is successful and the Europeans continue to behave as hardnosed creditors, the stability of the international monetary system will be undermined, not enhanced.

If there were no alternatives to the loss of freedom and proliferation of bureaucratic controls over international financial transactions, the American public might be induced to swallow the bitter draught. But there is nothing immutable in a system of fixed exchange rates, indeed nothing patently advantageous. The time has come for a frank debate on the issue of whether we would not all be better off if the dollar were permitted to float freely in the foreign exchange markets.

[From the Mining Journal]

TRAVEL TAX PROPOSAL

A Marquette couple has been saving for years for a trip to western Europe to visit the areas in which the husband served in the U.S. Army during World War II. Now they find that the trip for which they had been budgeting closely may cost them considerably more than they had anticipated—depending on how Congress reacts to President Johnson's proposal to place a federal tax on travel outside the western hemisphere.

The administration's proposal calls for a graduated travel tax on spending in excess of

\$7 a day and a 5 per cent levy on overseas plane and ship tickets. The objective is to discourage travel overseas, thus helping to alleviate the balance of payments deficit.

There is no denying that steps should be taken to plug partially the outflow of dollars from the United States. Last year the gap between the amount United States travelers spent abroad and the total spent by foreign travelers in this country was \$2,000,000,000—in favor of the foreigners, of course.

But is a tax of the type proposed by the administration a satisfactory approach to the problem? We don't think so.

The administration proposal, even though it asks for a graduated tax, hits the low income traveler far harder than it affects the jet set tourist. Both are given the \$7 per day exemption. From \$7 to \$15 daily, the tax would be 15 per cent and above \$15 per day it would be 30 per cent. A tax of \$110, for example, would put a bigger bite in the little fellow's budget than a tax of \$1,000 would put in the jet setter's budget.

But the biggest objection to the proposed tax is that it would be damaging both to traditional American concepts of freedom of movement and to healthy cultural interchanges.

As someone once remarked, "It is fitting that we rededicate ourselves to the importance of promoting international goodwill through travel." That someone was President Lyndon B. Johnson. The occasion was the reaffirmation by the United Nations last year of the principle of freedom of travel.

The proposed travel tax (or ban, really) is unacceptable on moral grounds in an age when the United States should actually be seeking to encourage travel as a means of improving understanding of other peoples, cultures and nations. Various groups in this country—including the federal government itself—have worked in the past to increase travel abroad by American students and others. Now that very government is seeking to usurp the right of its citizens to come and go as they please. There must be better ways of reducing the balance of payments gap.

One of them is to encourage—rather than discourage—travel. This would involve the adoption of another part of the administration's program to cut the dollar drain—the portion calling for promotion of foreign travel in the United States. In a report on this subject, a White House task force recommended creation of a national tourist office and other steps to lure more foreign visitors to the United States. This would help check the dollar drain somewhat at the same time that it was increasing cultural interchanges.

Meanwhile, the tax proposed on American travel should be scuttled altogether.

[From the Hudson (N.Y.) Register Star, Jan. 31, 1968]

TRAVEL CURBS?

The hostile response to President Johnson's proposed curbs on travel abroad makes it a fair guess that Congress will not go along with imposing restrictions. Whatever Congress does, there are persuasive arguments against inhibiting travel rights as a means of stemming the dollar outflow.

The considerations involved are, in a manner of speaking, both practical and philosophical. One important practical factor is that it would be difficult to enforce travel restrictions. Those bent on evading them could readily use Canada as a jumping-off point to either Europe or the Orient. Also, by what standards can it be decided that this trip is for pleasure, that one for business? Further, there is a good chance that the counteraction—the undesirable impact on travel from abroad to the United States, and on imports of U.S. goods—would heavily undermine whatever reduction in the balance-of-payments deficit was achieved.

Another point not to be ignored is that any tax imposed with the intention of dis-

couraging travel would have that effect only on persons of limited means. The wealthy, or the businessman on an expense account—those, in short, who spend most heavily abroad—would pay the difference without trouble. Teachers and students with what might be called educational or cultural travel in mind would be the ones to have their plans disrupted by some sort of monetary penalty on going abroad.

One final consideration merits particular emphasis. The right to travel wherever and whenever one pleases without undue restriction is vital to the American tradition. The Supreme Court has rebuffed attempts by the State Department to inhibit this right, arguing that it is "an important aspect of the citizen's liberty." In a 1958 decision Associate Justice Douglas described the right to travel, along with the rights of assembly and association, as part of "the very essence of a free society." This, above all, should be kept in mind by Congress when it considers whether travel restrictions are an acceptable way of slowing down the dollar drain.

[From the New York Times]

TOURIST TAX

The Administration's program for reducing the \$2 billion drain generated by American tourists may have been devised with the best of intentions: To interfere as little as possible with the traditional freedom of travel, to avoid penalizing students and teachers and yet to cut down on the excessive outlays of those who have plenty of money to spend and have been spending it freely abroad. But despite some good features, this ingenious and complicated proposal seems so full of holes that it looks more like something hastily devised to help get the White House off the balance-of-payments hook than as legislation it seriously expects Congress to adopt.

The 5 per cent excise tax on all airline fares and a similar tax on all ship tickets outside the Western Hemisphere, as well as a lowering of the duty-free allowance to a nominal \$10, are reasonable and practical proposals. But the more important part of the plan—the imposition of temporary taxes on spending abroad—appears to be neither reasonable nor practical.

While it certainly has its faults, the American tax system has proved more successful than most because of the excellent record of voluntary compliance of taxpayers. The proposed new tourist taxes would make a mockery out of the established principle of voluntary compliance. If Americans are to be asked to estimate their travel expenses and made subject to spot checks to determine just how much money they are taking with them, they will inevitably fall into the kind of evasive practices that have become almost normal in some other countries. Such a result could thoroughly undermine taxpayer morale and morality.

The Administration's proposal would be expensive and ineffective as well; it would almost surely result in retaliation by other countries. There is also the danger that Americans would be tempted to place funds abroad, adding to the outflow instead of reducing it.

While the 5 per cent transportation tax and the lowering of the duty-free limit are worth adopting, the Administration would be wise to place far greater emphasis than it has yet done on programs to attract foreign visitors to the United States. Here is a virtually untapped source of dollars, embodying the positive principle of encouragement to travel instead of the negative approach thus far adopted.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

PLAYING INTO THE HANDS OF THE PROTECTIONISTS

In Congress and elsewhere the Administration has fought long and hard for freer trade, but now it seems ready to meekly abandon the field to the protectionists.

It's hard to see how anything else can emerge from the grab bag of measures, taken and proposed, to try to deal with the chronic deficit in the country's international accounts. The Administration has so denuded itself of intellectual armor that it should be an easy opponent for the steel, textile and other industries eager to curb competing imports.

Now that the Administration has cast an oppressive blanket of controls over foreign investment, its spokesmen will face quit a credibility gap if they press for freedom of interchange in commercial transactions. Will the real Administration please stand up?

Federal officials similarly will find it difficult to argue that trade controls results in undesirable discrimination among industries. They are, after all, pushing for incredibly complex tax barriers to travel outside the Western Hemisphere, a proposal that amounts to blatant discrimination in favor of tourism in the U.S.

As if the Administration hadn't already been far too helpful to the protectionists, it presently is considering "some sort of tax on imports." The proponents of trade curbs could hardly have been handed a more open invitation to work their will in Congress.

Nor will it help Federal officials to stress that their restrictive measures are merely temporary, intended to defend the harassed dollar. So far as we've heard, no steel executive is talking of permanent quotas on steel and none has missed an opportunity to describe the wonders that quotas would work for the balance of payments.

The upshot, in the current session of Congress, is sure to be pressure from many sides for fresh restrictions on imports. And let no one delude himself that the mishmash of controls, if it's enacted, would actually be temporary.

Quota-hungry U.S. businessmen try to justify such controls in part by noting that other nations impose similar restrictions on goods sold by this country. Surely no one is naive enough to believe that when the U.S. imposes curbs other countries will react by removing theirs; a more likely response will be even stiffer curbs abroad, and thus more trouble for U.S. foreign trade.

In a tightly protected domestic market, moreover, U.S. firms would have less incentive to seek the increased efficiency and new products that would make them more competitive in world markets. The way would be eased for intensified price inflation at home and additional export setbacks abroad.

As a result, the problem of the Government and the import-plagued businessmen would be likely to get worse, not better. All too probably there would then be pressure for still more controls.

What makes this prospect especially sad is that the U.S. for so long had been providing the world with a far more attractive example, leading other nations a long way forward from the trade-restrictionist atmosphere of earlier years. Not at all coincidentally, growing freedom of trade and investment was accompanied by steadily expanding prosperity for the U.S.

These gains have in recent years been imperiled by other Governmental measures: Coddling of labor unions and sloppy financial housekeeping. It will be a long road back to policies of freedom and responsibility, even if the Administration ever elects to take it.

Certainly its progress won't be aided now by playing into the hands of the protectionists.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News]

TAXING TOURISTS

The tax on tourists' overseas spending, which President Johnson has proposed to help reduce the unfavorable balance of international payments, attempts to meet protests against unduly burdening teachers, students and others traveling on small budgets.

A student prepared to spend \$600 in a two-month European stay—based on Treasury Secretary Fowler's report that \$10 a day is typical—is hardly likely to cancel because of a \$27 tax. Nor is a traveler who has long been dreaming of a three-week tour at a modest \$15 a day likely to be upset by a levy of \$25. As for the rich, they are not likely to be stopped by the proposed tax.

Even though the tax rate doubles on spending of more than \$15 a day, the total effect still may be more nuisance than deterrent. Similarly, the proposed 5 per cent excise tax on plane and ship fares would probably provide little or no restraint.

The President himself acknowledged as much in predicting, in his State of the Union message, that even under the proposed limitations Americans will travel more overseas this year than ever. Furthermore, the \$500 million by which the President hopes to slow tourist spending is only about one-seventh of the deficit in the balance of payments.

So what Congress is asked to approve is a form of tourist harassment that at best would have a negligible effect on the balance.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe]

THE OTHER SIDE OF TRAVEL

President Johnson's New Year's Day call for drastically curtailing the travel of Americans abroad to help solve the balance of payments problem has stirred up a storm, and doubtless the storm will increase when, in about three months, legislation is proposed to Congress to back up the curbs.

The administration is said to be thinking not in terms of banning certain kinds of travel or of limiting how much money a traveler could take abroad, but in terms of a surtax on plane or ship tickets, and a tax on each day spent abroad.

But such taxes will hardly discourage the "jet set" and the well-to-do; their chief burden will fall, rather, on the teachers and students and the less well-to-do whose trips abroad accomplish far more for international understanding than the big spenders do.

Yet no one can dispute the seriousness of the payments deficit, and it is also undeniable that tourism abroad plays a significant part in it. Secretary of State Rusk on Thursday noted that American tourists spent \$4 billion abroad last year while foreign travelers spent \$2 billion here, leaving a \$2 billion "gap."

However, Commerce Department figures show that two-thirds of last year's \$600 million increase in Americans' spending abroad was attributable to Montreal's "Expo 67." And there is another side to the travel coin which has not been emphasized enough, and might even change the balance.

That is the amount of travel which can be induced to come to this country. U.S. Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge told on this page last Sunday of the record \$1.6 billion spent here by foreign visitors last year, when such travelers were more than double the number in 1961. This is progress, but the total of a little over a million is still ridiculously low, given Europe's prosperity.

More can be done to attract foreign tourists here. Why not publicize better such bargain rates as Greyhound's \$99 and the airlines' \$220 for travel anywhere in the country?

And, if the balance of payments is so important, certain subsidies to attract foreign tourists might be considered. The government should think imaginatively about the matter. For America is indeed the most attractive country on earth to visit, and given a workable program, the tourist "gap" could become a favorable one and no travel restrictions on Americans would be necessary.

This other side of travel involves not merely a matter of money and the balance of trade, but foreign relations, the making of

friends abroad, and, ultimately, world peace. We'll neglect it at our peril.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 21, 1968]

OPEN ARMS POLICY

The Special Task Force on Travel, named by the President to help close the travel gap by luring more foreign visitors to these shores, has done an astonishingly swift and efficient job. It has come up with something more than a bunch of impressive theories. It has already produced some impressive results.

The idea is to reduce the balance of payments deficit by creating a countercurrent to the flood of American travelers abroad. And to this end, the task force set out to make it easier for Europeans to get here, and to make living and traveling within the United States as painless as possible.

Four airlines—two American and two European—have already agreed to chop 25 percent off their Transatlantic fares for European travelers. Domestic airlines have agreed to a 50 percent reduction. Hotels, motels, trains, buses, car rental agencies and health insurers have also agreed to welcome the foreign visitor with open arms and with lowered rates.

The expectation is that these measures will reduce the travel gap by \$150 million this year, which is not a very big drop in the \$4 billion balance of payments bucket. But this year is only the beginning. The program can logically be expected to grow steadily in succeeding years. And taken together with the other methods that have been proposed to strengthen the dollar—cuts in expenditures, the surtax and temporary travel restrictions—the total program adds up to quite a meaningful package.

It is worthy of note that a number of foreign governments, particularly those which currently maintain a favorable balance of payments, have indicated that they will cooperate with plans to curb the American wanderlust to the extent of not making any retaliatory moves to inhibit travel to America by their citizens. Some will, in fact, join in the effort to promote tourism in the United States.

This cooperation is not altruism. It results from a realistic recognition of the fact that the dollar is being threatened and that if it is ever damaged, all the world will feel the wound.

The European cooperation is also predicated on the belief that America is fully aware of the danger to the dollar, and is prepared now to take the bitter medicine of cuts in spending and higher taxes. Europe will not accept any move by this country to lessen the balance of payments deficit solely at the expense of Europe. Nor should it be expected to do so.

[From the New York Times]

A PLAN TO SEE AMERICA, AND EUROPE, TOO, FIRST

(By HENRY S. REUSS)

The President is properly trying to bring under control our balance of payments, including the tourist account. But trying to achieve the needed improvement in the tourist ledger by keeping as many as a million Americans at home who otherwise might visit Europe looks at the problem from the wrong end.

Restricting the freedom of travel of Americans is an odious form of intervention, particularly for a country that talks about "opening windows." It is administratively very difficult, leading to Prohibition-era types of evasion. It may well fall hardest on the student and moderate-income traveler. And it almost inevitably leads to retaliation, official or private.

BRINGING EUROPEANS HERE

Fortunately, it is not too late to switch our signals and accentuate the positive in

tourism: Forget about a "head tax" on American tourists to Europe and instead attract to America in 1968—and if needed thereafter—an additional half-million to one million Europeans. This would achieve the same benefits for our balance of payments, but would do so by expansion rather than by restriction.

Since 1961, the United States Travel Service, through its package tours, its offices in leading European cities, its programs to see American homes, industry and scenery, has expanded European travel to this country to 600,000-700,000 annually.

With tens of millions of affluent Europeans now flooding Spain, France, Italy, Yugoslavia and Eastern Europe it would be no great trick to lure an extra one-half million to one million tourists to this country. But how?

We could do it, I believe, if we started now to package tours to the United States in which the bait was a once-in-a-lifetime \$100 travel stamp booklet, free to every first-time European traveler to the United States, and spendable in all participating United States air, rail, bus and car rental carriers, hotels and motels. Properly advertised, it could attract the additional Europeans we need, since it would constitute a gift of some 20 per cent of their average expenditures on United States travel.

The American travel industry, meeting in New York on Jan. 9, endorsed the travel stamp proposal. A participating United States business would meet half the travel cost, the United States Treasury the other half.

I estimate the cost of the United States subsidy at \$40 million—surely not out of line with the billions we are spending for the supersonic transport with no balance-of-payments payoff until 1975, or with the \$200 million the President has requested to promote United States exports.

A SMALL SUBSIDY

Indeed, the budgetary cost need be nothing: the extra \$250 million to be spent here by 500,000 additional European tourists (all a plus for our balance of payments, incidentally) would generate some \$750 million of gross national product, which in turn would yield the Treasury an extra \$75 million in revenues.

The proposed tourist incentive stamp could not possibly be offensive to Europeans. It violates no commitments in the GATT, or anywhere else. It closely resembles the "Eurail Pass" by which European countries grant substantial discounts on their government-owned railroads to Western Hemisphere tourists in Europe.

AID TO ECONOMY

Incidentally, the tourist-stamp proposal could improve business and reduce hard-core joblessness here without causing inflationary pressures. The \$250-million infusion of European travel spending into the American economy will fall not upon overtaxed United States resources but upon the transportation, hotel and restaurant industry, all of which now have much under-used capacity. The proposal would increase jobs, particularly in transportation, hotels and restaurants, for unskilled and semiskilled workers.

The President's task force, under Ambassador Robert McKinney, is now considering the proposal. If adopted, it could give our balance of payments the maximum of improvement with the minimum of tears.

(NOTE.—Representative REUSS, Democrat from Wisconsin, is chairman of the International Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee.)

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Feb. 12, 1968]

TRAVEL LEVY LOOKS WORSE

The more we hear about the proposed tax on travel overseas the worse it sounds.

Even if it works as its authors intend, it would not cut the so-called tourist deficit by half a billion dollars, as some have contended, but only by \$100,000,000. The rest of this half billion would be domestic revenue, from the tax itself and from increased customs collections. This has no bearing on the international balance of payments.

Washington has been using a figure of \$2 billion for the extent of the present tourist deficit. This is artificially high. In 1966 the deficit was \$1.6 billion, including a questionable transportation item. Without this it was only about \$1 billion. American tourists visiting Expo 67 in Montreal, a once-in-a-lifetime occurrence, accounted for most of the increase last year, and their spending would not have been affected by the proposed tax.

The tax plainly invites retaliation at a time when the tourist pendulum is swinging strongly toward a balance without these restrictions. Americans spent \$1.4 billion in foreign countries other than Mexico and Canada in 1966, an increase of 41 per cent in six years. Foreigners from these other countries spent \$560,000,000 in the United States in 1966, an increase of 155 per cent in six years. This promising growth is nearly four times as rapid as that of U.S. tourist spending and offers the only long-range answer to the problem. Foreign countermeasures, like those the United States now proposes, could halt this development quickly.

The announced tourist deficit takes no account of sizable purchases by foreign countries of U.S.-built aircraft and similar travel-connected dollar spending. Air France, for example, has bought or ordered jets worth \$410,000,000 in recent years, with options amounting to another \$300,000,000. The company will spend \$37,000,000 of its dollar earnings this year for operating expenses in this country, another \$30,000,000 for aircraft components and spare parts, and is installing a \$30,000,000 U.S. computer system.

If international traffic is cut back by U.S. action at least some of these outlays will be curtailed. Japan has cautioned it might have to reconsider jetliner orders in the United States. There are many vulnerable points.

Most ominous of all, the tourist tax seems slated in Congress to become a stringbag for any number of other protectionist measures. Their individual backers, lumped together, could override the genuine and justified opposition to the travel tax as such. In an election year the temptations to indulge in this congressional horsetrading are magnified. A generation of hard-won progress toward freer trade and travel, with all their multiple benefits, could be reversed.

[From Aviation Week & Space Technology]

AN UNNECESSARY BLOW

President Lyndon B. Johnson's proposal to ban travel by Americans outside the Western Hemisphere is one of the most tyrannical proposals ever made in this democracy and a totally unnecessary blow to the booming commercial aviation business of this nation. There is no disagreement that the U.S. faces an extremely serious foreign exchange problem which threatens to erode the position of the dollar. Nor is there much disagreement that President Johnson has let the situation deteriorate badly during his Administration without taking any effective action until stark crisis now confronts him.

The travel ban is typical of the panicky, ill-considered measures that will pop out of the White House in this election year as the President tries to patch up his shaky federal fiscal structure for at least an appearance of strength before that decisive day in November. It also is typical of the haphazard non-systems approach that is in vogue among White House planners these days that they would propose the tourist ban solution to the balance-of-payments problem apparently

without realizing the economic havoc it could wreck on what is now a growing and prosperous U.S. industry.

The airline business and the manufacturing industry that provides its equipment employ more than 1.5 million U.S. citizens. The airline industry alone created 30,000 new jobs in the U.S. during 1967, and manufacturing employment normally would rise by almost 100,000 during 1968. But the continued growth of this industry is predicated on the free and untrammelled movement of U.S. citizens around the globe for both business and pleasure.

If President Johnson's tyrannical travel ban proposal is translated into law, here are some of the effects it could have:

Cause substantial unemployment in both the airline and aerospace manufacturing industries as a result of jet transport order cancellations by U.S. and foreign airlines.

Lose most or all of a \$2.5-billion backlog of foreign airline orders for U.S. transports already on the books and cut off hope for any future orders from abroad.

Lose most of the \$1.7 billion now spent in the U.S. annually by foreign visitors, as foreign governments would certainly retaliate by restrictions on their own nationals traveling in the U.S. Foreign travel in the U.S. has increased over \$500 million in the last four years and had excellent growth prospects.

Shake the already weak financial structure of Britain by eliminating U.S. tourist traffic—one of Britain's major sources of foreign exchange.

Strike heavy economic blows to the booming tourist industries of our NATO allies—Denmark, Norway, West Germany, Belgium, Holland, Portugal, Italy and Greece.

Cripple and retard the economic growth of the Pacific basin, which is heavily dependent on new airline route awards in the trans-Pacific case and a substantial expansion of air traffic between the U.S. and Asia.

The President's travel ban proposal offers some enforcement headaches similar to those suffered by U.S. citizens under the 18th Amendment. The distinguished columnist James Reston noted in the New York Times that they would quickly create a "bootleg" foreign travel market in Canada. Travel-determined U.S. citizens could buy tickets to Montreal and Vancouver and then jump off for wherever they pleased in Europe or the Pacific with no telltale marks in their passports. Although the presidential proposal was aimed at "non-essential" foreign travel, the process of separating the tourist from the business traveler would defy the capabilities of federal bureaucracy, including the FBI.

However, with all its dire effects and outrageous limitation on personal liberty, we and probably most other American citizens might be more sympathetic to the President's proposal if it really offered any effective solution to the foreign exchange problem. But it does not.

The \$2-billion foreign travel deficit estimated for 1967 is just a drop in the bucket compared with the flood of dollars the U.S. government has been pouring abroad during the Johnson Administration with profligate enthusiasm.

In the same fiscal year that he shed crocodile tears over the tourist travel imbalance, President Johnson is sending \$2.3 billion abroad as foreign aid and exhorted the 90th Congress to give him even more for this purpose. During the past four years, his Administration has sent a golden flood of \$15.5 billion to all corners of the globe under its foreign aid program. In addition, obsolete U.S. military commitments abroad are consuming unmentioned billions annually in this vital foreign exchange.

This grave balance-of-payments problem has not been caused, as the President im-

plies, by American tourists on a spending spree abroad. It has, in fact, been caused by the foreign and fiscal policies of his Administration for which he, as chief executive, must take responsibility. His exhortations to Americans to stop European travel while he makes very little effort indeed to shut off the federal foreign funding spigot reflect the same Johnsonian logic that pleads with the citizens to ask him for higher income taxes while he protects his gas and oil cronies in their snug depletion refuge.

If this Administration is so inept that it proposes to plug one small leak in the foreign payments dike with action that will cause a flood of unemployment and economic disaster, it deserves a careful calendar watch until November. If it is as disrespectful of basic American liberties as the travel ban implies, it also may be time to reach for the pitchfork, pike and flintlock to defend those American liberties in the same manner in which they were won.

—ROBERT HOTZ.

[From the National Observer]

THAT TAX ON TRAVEL

To the surprise of no one, President Johnson last week finally proposed a tax on Americans who travel outside the Western Hemisphere. And to the surprise of a very few, the plan is a bad one; the tax would be punitive, an administrative pain in the neck, and likely to fall in its purpose.

The Administration surely would object to seeing its travel tax labeled as a punishment. But consider the logic behind the proposal.

The country is faced with a severe balance-of-payments deficit—more dollars flowing out of the country than come into it. In looking for ways to eliminate the deficit, Administration experts have studied the record and discovered that an ever-increasing number of Americans are taking vacations and their vacation dollars abroad. These are not the fabulously wealthy jet-setters, who have always found it easy to skip about the globe, but the middle-income citizens who, perhaps after years of saving, finally can meet the cost of comfortable though carefully budgeted travel outside their homeland. This increase in middle-class tourism has contributed to the dollar outflow, and it now seems logical (although unfair) to levy a tax on it.

To pile on the insult, the burdensome chore of administering the tax would be put largely on the shoulders of the traveler himself. He would file a declaration before boarding the plane or boat, undoubtedly be required to do some bookkeeping during his trip, then file a return when he gets back. And he must pay his tax in advance of his travel, settling up later if he has overpaid or underpaid. The system of voluntary compliance and prepayment has worked well with the Federal income tax; how it would work with a tax that is not essentially a revenue-raising tax is another matter. We assume that most tourists will be honest, yet the possibilities for getting around full payment boggle the imagination. And this means the Government will have to keep its computers humming and its tax sleuths busy.

THE THREAT OF RETALIATION

All to what purpose? The purpose is to keep tourist dollars at home, and it may work. But for years the Government has been supporting efforts to attract more foreign tourists to these shores, and countries that find that find American tourists profitable could retaliate by making it more difficult and costly for their citizens to visit the United States. In the strong likelihood that this would happen, much of the gain from Mr. Johnson's travel tax would vanish. The costs—in the curtailment of freedom and the administrative burden of collecting still another tax—would remain.

Congressional leaders seem to accept the idea of a travel tax, but a few are saying the

Johnson plan needs major revision to rid it of its bad features. That will be a tough job. The most constructive thing the lawmakers could do would be to toss the President's proposal in the waste basket.

[From the New York Post]

FOWLER'S "MONSTER"

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

WASHINGTON.—The latest lethal by-product of the balance-of-payments concoction let loose by President Johnson and Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler on New Year's Day is a hidden but intense struggle inside the Administration over trade policy.

Fowler is privately agreeing to Congressional demands for a tariff surcharge to get Congress to swallow the Administration's bitter travel tax. But he is running into strong opposition within the Administration from trade negotiators, State Dept. and Commerce Dept. policymakers, and even some of Fowler's own Treasury lieutenants.

What they are haggling about boils down to this: Is the plan to cut down on the flow of dollars from this country worth taking a sharp turn toward protectionism and economic isolationism? Fowler to the contrary notwithstanding, many Administration policymakers are saying "No." But the issue may be out of control.

Indeed, the New Year's Day plan intended to ease the balance-of-payments puzzle without going through long-range international monetary reforms may turn to be Joe Fowler's Frankenstein monster. Its uncanny growth may undermine this country's long-standing liberal trade policy without really curbing the dollar outflow as intended.

Starting point for the trouble is the travel tax scheme sketchily outlined in the New Year's Day message. There is no doubt that the Treasury originally intended a prohibitive head tax on U.S. travelers to keep them out of Europe the next two years. But the Administration, as well as some Congressional leaders, hardly miscalculated how much protest it would provoke.

Constituents bombarded Congressional offices with complaints. Parents grumbled that students' plans for European vacations would be ruined. Voters intending to visit relatives in the old country—including the politically potent Italian and Polish ethnic blocs—howled. Lobbyists for Pan American and TWA advised the Treasury the scheme would put them out of business.

The Treasury hastily retreated from a prohibitive tax, submitting instead a Rube Goldberg contraption taxing the amount of money spent by Americans in Europe on a graduated basis. Even if simplified by the House Ways and Means Committee, however, this scheme is so unpopular that it could not pass on the House floor on its own merits.

That is where the protectionist question comes in. Rep. Wilbur D. Mills of Arkansas, the all-powerful chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, has advised the Administration that a travel tax simply cannot pass without a protectionist trade gimmick attached. In fact, Rep. John Byrnes of Wisconsin, the committee's senior Republican, makes clear he will not give the travel tax his needed backing without a tariff surcharge of between 10 and 15 per cent.

Herein lies the Frankenstein nature of the original Fowler package. It contained a relatively modest 2 per cent "border tax"—a euphemism for an across-the-board tariff—to provide revenue for tax rebates for American exporters. This has been bloated up by Byrnes and other Congressmen to the 10 to 15 per cent surcharge.

In private conversations with Congressmen, Fowler has hinted he would be willing to pay this price. But there is sharp dissent and debate within the Administration. Secretary of State Dean Rusk is uneasy about

higher tariffs in inter-agency discussions. William Roth, chief U.S. trade negotiator, is dead set against it. Even Stanley Surrey, Fowler's own assistant secretary for taxation, tends to be opposed on theoretical grounds. The determination of the Administration's final position is much in doubt.

The balance may be tipped by Mills. Long a free-trader, Mills is now advising the Administration a tariff surcharge of the kind proposed by Byrnes is necessary to stave off a succession of individual commodity quotas roaring through in a Congressional orgy of protectionism.

[From the Boston Globe]

TAXES ON TRAVEL

The President's proposal to tax travel abroad has a hollow ring to it. Beset by what seems to be an endlessly overlapping series of crises in almost every area of governmental affairs, President Johnson has gone looking for ways to patch some of the gaping holes in the nation's facade.

His new budget has been viewed as a tight one in spite of the record expenditures for which it calls. And the President hopes to combine certain economies with a surtax on income and corporation tax payments to bring revenues and expenditures into some kind of balance.

The proposed travel tax, detailed before the House Ways and Means Committee Monday by Treasury Secretary Henry Fowler, would aim at reducing the gold drain by \$500 million.

It isn't worth it. Congress should not be overwhelmed by the forecasts of economic doom in international monetary circles that the administration will surely advance.

The right to free travel is part of the American image and the American reality. It is hard enough for increasing numbers of Americans to accumulate the extra money to finance an excursion to a foreign country without having to pay the government for the right to make the trip. To tax foreign travel is to restrict it to some extent. That is alien to the nation's purpose.

As for the gold drain, it would be better to live with the leak than to sacrifice an important principle in our effort to stop the flow.

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, Feb. 14, 1968]

UNPOPULAR TAX ON TRAVEL INFRINGES ON LIBERTIES AND SPURS EVASIONS

No tax proposal in recent years has generated more downright opposition than has President Johnson's recent suggestion that Congress levy a punitive tax on American travelers to countries outside this hemisphere.

The evils of this proposed travel tax are many and clearly apparent. To begin with, a travel tax by its very nature is the kind of tax that deliberately infringes on the liberties of American citizens by restricting their freedom of movement. This infringement is made even worse by the fact that it is a sort of discriminating infringement in that it hits hardest at those least able to ignore it.

To a wealthy person who wants to take a trip around the world, or simply to Europe, the possibility that he will have to pay a 30 per cent tax on all that he spends on his trip in excess of \$15 a day, isn't apt to discourage him from planning or taking such a trip.

But to the nonwealthy person who may have saved and scrimped for years to take such a trip, the piling on of such a tax on top of the other costs of the trip, will serve to make that planned trip so costly as to make it prohibitive.

There is a way, of course, to avoid the proposed tax. Those who can restrict their travel

spending to \$7 a day won't have to pay any tax. But how many Americans can or will travel on a spending budget limited to \$7 per day? Not very many, to be sure, and most of these will be young people who don't particularly care about where they have to stay or how they have to limit their eating, to stay within a \$7 per day limitation.

Between \$7 and \$15 per day the proposed tax rate is set at 15 per cent which supposedly will still permit a lot of overseas travel at not too punishing a tax rate. But here again we have a tax which is almost impossible to police efficiently, and which serves to punish the honest people and reward the dishonest.

The way President Johnson proposes to collect this tax is through a voluntary estimate and disclosure system. This will require persons traveling outside this hemisphere to file in advance an estimate of his projected daily expenditures and to pay in advance the tax levy on the projected costs. In connection with this cost estimate and tax payment, the traveler will also have to state how much money he is taking along with him.

Upon his return, the traveler will fill out another form detailing exactly what he did spend each day out of the country and his tax bill will then be refigured. If he spent more than he estimated in advance, an additional tax payment will be necessitated, or if he spent less, he will qualify for a refund of a portion of the tax already paid.

The complications in such a collection system are enormous and will inevitably spawn all kinds of tax-dodging devices almost impossible for the government tax collectors to even begin to surmount without the imposition of such elaborate safeguards as to make the cost of collecting the tax far outmeasure the revenue it will produce.

And what about those travelers who use American-owned airlines or who take long cruises on U.S. owned ships? Why should they be stuck with a punitive travel tax when the dollars they pay for their transportation and their food and lodging aboard ship will never leave this country or affect our balance of payments one way or another?

And if the Government wants to really help out our balance of payments structure, why doesn't it make available to American travelers some of the vast amount of foreign currency our government now holds, far in excess of its own needs for such currency?

This foreign currency could be purchased by American travelers before they left this country, thus accomplishing two purposes. American dollars would be left at home and our own government would be able to profitably dispose of some of the excess foreign currency it now holds as a result of our foreign aid program.

This proposed travel tax has already cost travel agents all over this country a tremendous amount of lost money in cancelled trips as people postpone planned journeys until they find out more about this whole deal.

The travel agents concerned have every right to be mad as wet hens over this deal, as there is nothing fair and nothing justifiable about this whole business. As the Wall Street Journal said editorially the other day, this proposed travel tax is just the latest edition of a weary story in that it again points out that for the mistakes of their government, the people will pay, not only with their money, but with their freedoms.

[From the Westchester Business Journal, Feb. 27, 1968]

THE TRAVEL TAX

The Administration in an effort to solve the complex economic problems and specifically the balance of trade payments has recommended a comprehensive list of taxes on travel.

International travel has wide ramifications to businessmen in Westchester and the tax

proposals will have an immediate effect and far reaching complications. The business most obviously effected will be travel agencies. Foreign trips by affluent Westchesterites will be influenced and curtailed perhaps not so much by the additional cost of the taxes but the more subtle reasons of patriotism. Business trips will also be canceled or cut short.

However, the travel taxes may have the adverse effect of restricting foreign trade. With both the major international companies in Westchester and the array of companies in the import-export business, the results could be devastating.

The House Ways and Means Committee under the chairmanship of Congressman Wilbur D. Mills started public hearings on the travel taxes that Congress has been asked to enact.

Thomas R. Wilcox, vice chairman of the First National City Bank, in a statement before the committee last week made some interesting and cogent points.

"It is difficult to understand why, out of our total imports of goods and services amounting to \$38 billion, travel was selected to be the sacrificial goat," Mr. Wilcox said that the proposed travel tax and lower duty-free allowances would actually produce net results "unfavorable" to the balance-of-payments problem they are intended to alleviate.

Spending for travel, he said, provides foreign nations with dollars needed to pay for their essential purchases of U.S. goods and services. In many undeveloped countries, U.S. tourist dollars are particularly important because other methods of earning dollars are limited and the need for tourists' dollars has become more urgent as our foreign aid programs have been reduced.

"To say we have a trade surplus and a travel deficit is statistical double talk. Much of the travel deficit becomes the foreign exchange used to buy American goods, which is reported as trade surplus," he told the committee members.

The real problem, he pointed out, is bringing about a better balance between U.S. and foreign expenditures on travel abroad, rather than limiting the growth of American travel.

It would be "dangerous" to tamper with our travel relations with other countries when such action might provoke restrictive measures that would work to our detriment.

Concluding his testimony before the House committee, Mr. Wilcox pointed out that the proposed tax would have these negative results:

- Reverse a 20 year-old trade policy calling for expanded world trade through continuing reductions in government-imposed barriers.

- Cause world-wide repercussions, invite retaliation and injure our export expansion program.

- Discriminate against the travel industry and impose severe financial hardships on 6,000 travel agents who are mostly small businessmen with an average of five employees each.

- Require an "enormous" bureaucratic structure to collect these taxes and duties.

- Increase airport congestion enormously because of new procedures required.

- "Severely" injure the excellent program to increase U.S. travel earnings from foreign visitors proposed by the Presidential Task Force.

Mr. Ralph C. Gross, president of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York added more harsh words and labeled the proposed legislation "a negative philosophy of economic isolation." He warned that the restrictive measures being considered ultimately might depress the economy, especially in New York and other gateway cities which depend heavily on trade and travel activities.

Mr. Gross also urged adoption of a positive program to ease the problem including

a broad campaign to encourage people from other lands to visit the United States.

In line with positive programs to increase foreign spending rather than limiting U.S. spending, Trans World Airlines has been very active. TWA is initiating a program to "sell" the U.S. as a convention site for European businessmen. Developed under the aegis of the International Association of Convention Bureaus, TWA plans to make presentations in London, Paris, Brussels, The Hague and Geneva to executives of professional associations and major business firms and travel agents specializing in convention travel arrangement.

The primary purpose of the program is to bring international conventions to America but also aims to promote attendance by Europeans at American conventions and sell the U.S. as a travel destination.

TWA will also continue its programs of "Visit USA Editors Tour." For the last three years, the airline has transported and conducted a national tour for European editors and travel writers. This year the focal point of the two-week tour is HemisFair '68, the first world's fair to be held in the Southwest.

The House Ways and Means Committee will hear the pros and cons and perhaps Rep. Mills will close the doors as he has often done before on unneeded tax proposals. Nevertheless, just the prospect of such a tax has already had an effect. Travel plans are usually made well in advance and now that a trip to Europe could be unpatriotic, the old cottage at the lake will again be the happy summer scene.

But an even more far reaching eventuality, even assuming this tax proposal doesn't become law now, is that it was suggested and it could be enacted in a later session of Congress. How does a corporate executive plan foreign business commitments and what trade agreements can be expected with the struggling nations. Sometimes the hint of an action has a greater effect than the action itself.

People Have the Right To Know

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, on March 8 it was my privilege to be a guest at the 102d annual convention of the Minnesota Newspaper Association.

Universal concern was expressed by the rural editors attending that convention over the ever-growing news censorship at every level of government.

In addition to their verbal expressions on this subject, many of the editors, during the past couple of weeks, wrote editorials on this subject.

In order to share the thinking in these editorials with my colleagues, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time an editorial written by Jim McDonnell of the Wright County Journal-Press of Buffalo, Minn.: "People Have the Right To Know."

PEOPLE HAVE THE RIGHT TO KNOW

Several ominous signs have emerged from Viet Nam in recent weeks. One of the darkest signs is the plan for censorship on some aspects of war information which was introduced this week.

Censorship is not new to the American news media. They have worked under it in other wars. If American lives are being lost because of information the enemy is gaining

in news dispatches, well then lets have censorship in the war zone.

But let's not kid ourselves about whose right to know will be ended by censorship—it's yours and mine. In a war where the enemy wears civilian clothes and probably lives next door, how do you keep secrets like how many rockets exploded on your airbase. The enemy can see for himself. It is the American people who are supplying their sons and their treasure to support the operations which their government has deemed necessary in Viet Nam. Now at least they have a right to know the cost of these actions in lives and to have a realistic picture of the situation they are asked to endorse and support.

A censorship program, however well intentioned, can start out covering up little losses here or there and end up shrouding the whole political and military operations so that we will never know what went on in Viet Nam. We've had about enough examples of government impounding information which won't be released until our grandchildren are retired.

Rather than too much information, it seems most of our present trouble stems from too little information in the hands of the American people—going back to the Gulf of Tonkin "incidents".

Had the American people been given a full, frank, honest and prompt appraisal of the Tonkin Gulf situation, there would probably be no American involvement in the Viet Nam war now.

Objective Review of Nation's Economic Position Needed

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the present preoccupation we must give to meeting the international problems facing the dollar, an objective review of our Nation's economic position is in order. Last week the Joint Economic Committee directed its attention to the Nation's economic health with Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz as a supposedly learned witness. The distinguished Washington veteran, Mr. Willard Edwards, in his Chicago Tribune "Capitol Views" column is

so intrigued by Mr. Wirtz's testimony that he made it a colloquy, with our great colleague, DONALD RUMSFELD, the subject of his March 14 column. Mr. Edwards' treatment of the matter makes its own points most effectively. The column follows:

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, March 13.—As a daring and imaginative experiment in wishful thinking, the testimony was so comforting that most members of the joint economic committee sat spellbound.

Willard Wirtz, secretary of labor, was engaged in a game of make-believe which had irresistible appeal. Quite simply, in a discussion of the national economy, he pretended that the war in Viet Nam did not exist.

Elsewhere on Capitol hill, congressional committees were agonizing about the conflict in Southeast Asia, its uncertain course, its growing casualty lists, its 30 billion dollar annual cost. Here, before the committee concerned with the fiscal health of the nation, it had vanished from view.

Seven years of "unprecedented economic expansion," had been recorded under the Kennedy-Johnson administration, Wirtz said. It was "an extraordinary record." Unemployment, for example, had been reduced to record low levels. It was now down to 3.5 per cent.

Nowhere, in his vision of an economy untouched by a major war, did Wirtz even hint that this reduction in the ranks of the jobless might have been helped by the addition since 1961 of a million men to the armed services and of 578,000 to the government payroll.

He almost got away with it. At the last moment, Rep. Donald Rumsfeld (R., Ill.) broke the spell. He confessed himself puzzled and disturbed by a yawning gap in the secretary's testimony.

HAD WAR DISAPPEARED AS A FACTOR?

What, he asked, had happened to the war in Viet Nam? Had it disappeared as a factor in the national economy?

RUMSFELD—Is it correct that, at no place in your statement, do you relate what is going on in this country economically to the war and in no place do you adjust any of your figures to reflect the impact of the war?

WIRTZ—There is no—so far as I can think of—no reference to that.

RUMSFELD—You have said that the United States has seen seven years of unprecedented economic expansion, calling it extraordinary. I question that it can be described that way if it is put in the context of a war economy.

You boast that the unemployment rate is the lowest since the Korean conflict, which represented a war economy just as the economy today does. Isn't it a fact that we have a higher rate of unemployment today than during the Korean war? Doesn't the drop in unemployment reflect precisely the escalation of the war?

WIRTZ [Irritated]—If I thought we were dependent for employment on the war, I would resign from the human race. This record does not depend upon the military effort. I do not think these unemployment figures will get worse when the war ends. I think it will take about 60 days for us to recover our stride.

UNEMPLOYMENT RATE LOSES LUSTER

Some statistical bickering ensued. The Viet Nam war unemployment rate of 3.5 per cent, over which Wirtz had enthused, lost some of its luster. Unemployment at the height of the Korean war had been lowered to 2.9 per cent.

"Your own figures show that we're not doing very well once you take in the fact that the economy is benefiting from the war," said Rumsfeld.

Wirtz would not concede that "war factors" had produced low unemployment. "The significant thing," he announced, "is that the administration has learned how to make the economy its servant instead of its master."

He departed, presumably brooding over the dangers of testifying too long. Some liberals saw him go with a sympathetic eye. He had made a nice try at developing a new guns-and-butter theory. You can have them both by ignoring the cost of the guns.

Federal Government and Education— Part II

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, during my speech on March 14, I mentioned the 111 programs which are being administered by the Office of Education. Today I am submitting a list of these programs for the RECORD to show that the Congress has not been stingy in providing money for education at all levels:

PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION, FISCAL 1968

CONSTRUCTION

[Figures in parentheses indicate estimated amounts or money carried over from prior years, rather than fiscal 1968 appropriations]

Type of assistance	Purpose	Who may apply	Appropriation
Undergraduate facilities.....	Construct or improve undergraduate academic facilities.....	Colleges and universities.....	\$300,000,000
Undergraduate and graduate facilities.....	Loans to construct or improve higher education facilities.....	Public and private nonprofit institutions, cooperative centers, boards of higher education.....	200,000,000
Community colleges, technical institutes.....	Construct or improve academic facilities.....	Public community colleges and technical institutes.....	100,000,000
Graduate facilities.....	Construct or improve graduate academic facilities.....	Public and private academic institutions, graduate center boards.....	50,000,000
Facilities for educational research.....	Construct and equip national and regional research facilities.....	Educational laboratories and research development centers.....	(30,781,000)
Public libraries.....	Aid construction of public libraries.....	State library administrative agencies.....	27,185,000
Public schools.....	Aid school districts in providing minimum school facilities in federally impacted and disaster areas.....	Local school districts.....	22,937,000
Educational television.....	Aid in acquisition and installation of transmitting and production equipment for educational television broadcasting.....	Nonprofit agencies, public colleges, State television agencies, education agencies.....	(20,000,000)
Vocational facilities.....	Construct vocational education facilities in Appalachia.....	State education agencies in Appalachia.....	(7,000,000)
Area vocational schools.....	Construct or improve area vocational education school facilities.....	Public secondary and postsecondary schools providing education in 5 or more fields.....	(0)
Total.....			700,122,000 (57,781,000)

¹ Included in "Vocational programs" under "Programs, Instruction, and Administration," infra.

PROGRAMS, INSTRUCTION, AND ADMINISTRATION

[Figures in parentheses indicate estimated amounts or money carried over from prior years, rather than fiscal 1968 appropriations]

Type of assistance	Purpose	Who may apply	Appropriation
Programs for the disadvantaged.....	Support educational programs in areas having high concentrations of low-income families.	State education agencies.....	\$1,191,000,000
School maintenance and operation.....	Aid school districts on which Federal activities or major disasters have placed a financial burden.	Local school districts.....	416,200,000
Vocational programs.....	Maintain, extend, and improve vocational education programs; develop programs in new occupations.	Public schools.....	256,461,455
Supplementary centers.....	Support supplementary educational centers and services.	Local education agencies.....	208,750,000
Educational opportunity grants.....	Assist qualified high school graduates to go to college.	Colleges and universities.....	140,600,000
College work-study.....	Provide part-time employment for college students.	do.....	139,900,000
Occupational training and retraining.....	Provide training programs to equip persons for work in needed employment fields.	Local school authorities (public, private nonprofit).....	129,110,000
School library resources and instructional materials.....	Support provision of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials.	Local education agencies.....	104,457,000
Strengthening instruction in critical subjects in public schools.....	Strengthen instruction in science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects.	Local school districts.....	79,200,000
Adult basic education.....	Provide literacy programs for adults.	State education agencies.....	40,250,000
Public library services.....	Extend and improve public library services.	State library administrative agencies.....	35,000,000
Teacher institutes.....	Improve qualifications of elementary and secondary teachers and related specialists.	Colleges and universities.....	30,000,000
Strengthening developing institutions.....	Provide partial support for cooperative arrangements between developing and established institutions.	Accredited colleges and universities in existence at least 5 years.....	30,000,000
Strengthening State education agencies.....	Improve leadership resources of State education agencies.	State education agencies and combinations thereof.....	29,750,000
College library resources.....	Strengthen library resources of colleges and universities.	Institutions of higher education and combinations thereof.....	25,000,000
Guidance, counseling, and testing in public schools.....	Assist in establishing and maintaining guidance, counseling, and testing programs.	Public elementary and secondary schools, junior colleges, and technical institutes.....	24,500,000
Teacher training (handicapped).....	Prepare teachers and others who work in education of handicapped.	State education agencies, colleges and universities.....	24,500,000
Experienced teacher fellowships.....	Improve quality of education of elementary and secondary teachers and related personnel.	Institutions of higher education offering graduate programs.....	15,000,000
Programs for the handicapped.....	Strengthen educational and related services for handicapped children.	State education agencies.....	15,000,000
Endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts.....	Support instruction in agriculture and mechanic arts in land-grant colleges.	The 68 land-grant colleges.....	14,500,000
Acquisition of educational media.....	Improve instruction in selected subject areas.	Colleges and universities.....	14,500,000
Teacher Corps.....	Strengthen educational opportunities of children in low-income areas.	Local education agencies, colleges, and universities.....	13,500,000
Prospective teacher fellowships.....	Improve quality of education of persons planning careers in elementary and secondary education.	Institutions of higher education offering graduate programs.....	12,500,000
Strengthening community service programs.....	Strengthen higher education capabilities in helping communities solve their problems.	Colleges and universities.....	10,000,000
Vocational work-study.....	Provide part-time employment opportunities for vocational education students.	High schools, colleges, vocational or technical schools.....	10,000,000
Librarian training.....	Increase opportunities for training in librarianship.	Colleges and universities.....	8,250,000
Institutional assistance grants.....	Develop and strengthen teacher training programs (elementary-secondary).	Institutions participating in experienced teacher fellowships and prospective teacher fellowships programs, supra.....	7,500,000
Higher educational guarantee reserve funds.....	Provide adequate loan reserves for higher educational student loans.	State or nonprofit private guarantee agencies.....	(7,284,654)
Counselor institutes.....	Improve qualifications of guidance workers in schools and colleges.	Public and private nonprofit colleges and universities.....	7,250,000
Language and area centers.....	Improve quality of instruction in uncommon languages-area subjects.	Colleges and universities.....	5,830,000
Desegregation assistance.....	Aid school boards in hiring advisers and training employees on problems incident to school desegregation.	School boards and other agencies responsible for public school operation.....	5,245,000
Cuban student loans.....	Provide loan fund to aid Cuban refugee students.	Colleges and universities.....	(4,400,000)
Talent search.....	Assist in identifying and encouraging promising high school graduates.	State, local education agencies, public or nonprofit organizations.....	4,000,000
Facilities comprehensive planning.....	Help States plan higher education construction program.	State commissions that administer program.....	4,000,000
Civil defense adult education.....	Provide information on civil defense procedures to the public.	Chief State school officers or State agencies.....	3,565,000
Teacher institutes.....	Improve ability of school personnel to deal with problems incident to school desegregation.	Colleges and universities.....	3,255,000
State administration of Higher Education Facilities Act program.....	Help States administer program under title I of Higher Education Facilities Act.	State commissions that administer program.....	3,000,000
Foreign language training and area studies.....	Provide foreign curriculum specialists to U.S. schools to strengthen language-area studies programs.	Colleges and universities, State and local education agencies.....	3,000,000
Captioned film loan program.....	Provide cultural and educational services to the deaf through films.	Groups of deaf persons; nondeaf groups for training.....	2,800,000
Workshops, institutes in educational media.....	Improve capabilities of persons using educational media for undergraduate instruction.	Colleges and universities.....	2,500,000
Interlibrary cooperation.....	Planning for establishment of cooperative networks of libraries.	State library administrative agencies.....	2,375,000
State institutional library services.....	Planning for improved institutional library services.	do.....	2,120,000
Supervision and instruction.....	Strengthen administration in State education agencies.	State education agencies.....	2,000,000
Student loans—matching funds.....	Provide for loans to colleges and universities that cannot meet program's matching obligations.	Accredited nonprofit institutions (including business schools and technical institutes).....	2,000,000
Vocational guarantee reserve funds.....	Provide adequate loan reserves for vocational student loans.	State and private nonprofit guarantee agencies.....	(1,577,329)
Library services to physically handicapped.....	Planning for improved library services to physically handicapped.	State library administrative agencies.....	1,320,000
Strengthening instruction in nonpublic schools.....	Loans to private schools to improve instruction in critical subjects.	Nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools.....	1,000,000
Cuban refugee professional training.....	Provide refresher training programs for professional personnel.	Colleges and universities.....	500,000
Strengthening instruction in arts and humanities in public schools.....	Improve instructional capabilities of public schools in humanities-arts fields.	Public schools.....	440,000
Strengthening instruction in arts and humanities in nonpublic schools.....	Loans to private schools to improve humanities-arts instruction.	Private nonprofit schools.....	60,000
National teaching fellowships.....	Augment teaching resources of developing institutions.	Developing institutions nominating prospective fellows from established institutions.....	(1)
Foreign study extension.....	Assist U.S. institutions in promoting language and area studies abroad.	Colleges and universities.....	(2)
Teacher training (vocational).....	Improve qualifications of teachers, supervisors, and directors of vocational education programs.	Local school districts.....	(2)
Testing in nonpublic schools.....	Provide for aptitude-achievement testing of private school students.	Testing agencies.....	(1)
Services of foreign curriculum specialists.....	Support overseas training and research in language-area studies.	Colleges and universities, state education agencies.....	(2)
Researcher training.....	Develop and strengthen programs for training educational researchers.	State education agencies, institutions, and organizations.....	(1)
Total.....			3,081,688,455 (13,261,983)

1 Included in "Strengthening developing institutions," supra.

2 Included in "Foreign language training and area studies," supra.

3 Included in "Vocational programs," supra.

4 Included in "Guidance, counseling, and testing in public schools," supra.

5 Included in "Researcher training grants," under "Teacher training and student assistance," infra.

TEACHER TRAINING AND STUDENT ASSISTANCE

Type of assistance	Purpose	Who may apply	Appropriation
Student loans.....	Provide for low-interest loans to college students.....	College students.....	\$190,000,000
Graduate fellowships.....	Increase number of well-qualified college teachers.....	Prospective college teachers working toward doctoral degrees.....	86,600,000
Interest benefits for higher education loans.....	Provide interest benefits for student loans through commercial lenders.....	Students in eligible institutions of higher education.....	40,000,000
Foreign language fellowships.....	Assist in training of teachers and other specialists in modern foreign languages and area studies.....	Undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral students.....	6,870,000
Researcher training grants.....	Improve qualifications of educational researchers.....	Present and prospective researchers in education.....	6,750,000
Interest benefits for vocational loans.....	Provide interest benefits for insured loans for vocational school students made through commercial lenders.....	Business, trade, technical, and other vocational students.....	3,600,000
Technical assistance, training grants.....	Provide specialist training to foreign educators and strengthen education and economy in developing nations.....	Foreign nationals from countries with which United States has bilateral technical assistance agreements.....	2,000,000
Arts and humanities training grants (institutes).....	Strengthen teaching of humanities and arts in elementary and secondary schools.....	Persons engaged in or preparing to engage in teaching or supervising or training teachers.....	500,000
Foreign teacher development.....	Provide opportunity for foreign educators to observe U.S. methods, curriculum, organization (elementary and secondary).....	Foreign educators (administrators, teachers, teacher trainers, education ministry officials).....	420,000
Teacher exchange.....	Improve and strengthen relations between United States and foreign nations by exchange of teachers.....	Elementary and secondary teachers, college instructors, and assistant professors.....	350,000
Leadership and vocational training grants.....	Provide opportunities for Ryukyans to observe and study in United States to improve education, economy.....	Ryukyuan nationals selected by their government.....	21,711
Vocational teacher training grants.....	Improve qualifications of vocational education teachers.....	Teachers of vocational education subjects.....	(1)
Counseling and guidance training grants (institutes).....	Improve counseling of students in schools and colleges.....	Persons engaged in or preparing to engage in counseling and guidance of students.....	(2)
Captioned films—training grants.....	Improve quality of instruction available to deaf persons.....	Persons who will use captioned film equipment.....	(3)
Handicapped teacher fellowships and traineeships.....	Improve training of persons responsible for education of the handicapped.....	Persons employed or preparing for employment as teachers, supervisors, etc., of handicapped.....	(4)
Desegregation training grants.....	Improve ability of school personnel to deal with desegregation problems.....	Teachers and other personnel of public schools.....	(5)
Experienced teacher fellowships.....	Improve quality of education of elementary and secondary teachers and related personnel.....	Experienced teachers planning to continue in elementary and secondary teaching careers.....	(6)
Prospective teacher fellowships.....	Improve quality of education of persons planning careers in elementary and secondary education.....	Prospective teachers and school personnel in related professional areas.....	(7)
Teacher Corps.....	Strengthen educational opportunities of children in low-income area.....	Qualified teachers and prospective teachers.....	(8)
Teacher training grants (institutes).....	Improve quality of teachers, school librarians, other specialists.....	Teachers, teacher trainers, and supervisors in 12 areas.....	(9)
College work-study.....	Provide part-time employment for college students.....	College students.....	(10)
Study abroad.....	Assist U.S. institutions in promoting language and area studies.....	Professors, college and secondary school teachers.....	(11)
National teaching fellowships.....	Augment teaching resources of developing institutions.....	Highly qualified graduate students or junior faculty members from established institutions.....	(12)
Cuban student loans.....	Aid needy Cuban refugee college students to finance their education.....	Cubans who became refugees after Jan. 1, 1959.....	(13)
Librarian fellowships and traineeships.....	Increase opportunities throughout the Nation for training in librarianship.....	Fellows and others undergoing training in librarianship and related fields.....	(14)
Cuban professionals retraining grants.....	Aid Cuban refugee teachers and other professional personnel who need assistance for further study.....	Cuban refugee teachers, physicians, and other professional personnel.....	(15)
Vocational work study.....	Provide part-time employment for young people to help them begin or continue vocational training.....	Vocational education students.....	(16)
Occupational training and retraining.....	Train skilled workers in all sections of the Nation.....	Persons referred by State employment services.....	(17)
Adult basic education teacher training grants.....	Improve qualifications of teachers of adult basic education courses.....	Teachers and teacher trainers of adult basic education courses.....	(18)
Educational media personnel training grants (institutes).....	Improve capabilities of educational media specialists and others using such media at college level.....	Those who will use educational media for instruction at undergraduate level.....	(19)
Study abroad.....	Improve teacher competence and curriculums in modern foreign languages and area studies.....	Teachers and supervisors of foreign language-area studies (minimum 5 years' experience).....	(20)
Do.....	Improve instructional programs in National Defense Education Act language and area centers.....	Center faculty members.....	(21)
Do.....	Develop competence in language and area studies for graduate students preparing for college teaching.....	Graduate students preparing for college teaching of non-Western language and area studies.....	(22)
Summer seminars abroad.....	Improve quality of instruction in modern foreign languages and area studies in United States.....	Secondary school and college language-area studies teachers (minimum 2 years' experience).....	(23)
Educational opportunity grants.....	Assist qualified high school graduates to go to college.....	Promising high school graduates and college undergraduates of exceptional financial need.....	(24)
Total.....			337,111,711

ALL OF THE PROGRAMS MENTIONED IN THE FOLLOWING FOOTNOTES APPEAR UNDER "PROGRAMS, INSTRUCTION, AND ADMINISTRATION," SUPRA

¹ Included in vocational programs.² Included in guidance, counseling, and testing in public schools.³ Included in captioned film loan program.⁴ Included in teacher training (handicapped).⁵ Included in desegregation assistance.⁶ Included in experienced teacher fellowships.⁷ Included in prospective teacher fellowships.⁸ Included in Teacher Corps.⁹ Included in teacher institutes.¹⁰ Included in college work-study.¹¹ Included in foreign study extension.¹² Included in national teaching fellowships.¹³ Included in Cuban student loans.¹⁴ Included in librarian training.¹⁵ Included in Cuban refugee professional training.¹⁶ Included in vocational work-study.¹⁷ Included in occupational training and retraining.¹⁸ Included in adult basic education.¹⁹ Included in acquisition of educational media.²⁰ Included in foreign language training and area studies.²¹ Included in talent search.

RESEARCH

[Figures in parentheses indicate estimated amounts or money carried over from prior years, rather than fiscal 1968 appropriations]

Type of assistance	Purpose	Who may apply	Appropriation
Educational laboratories.....	Provide for development and testing of educational innovations until ready for classroom use.....	Colleges, universities, agencies, and organizations.....	\$23,800,000
Educational research (research, surveys, and evaluations).....	Support research on improvement of education at all levels and in all subject areas.....	Colleges, universities, State education agencies, private or public groups, or individuals.....	19,717,000
Vocational research.....	Support research, training, and pilot programs for special vocational needs.....	State education agencies, colleges and universities, nonprofit organizations, and local education agencies.....	13,550,000
Handicapped research and demonstration.....	Promote research and demonstration on education of handicapped.....	State education agencies, local school districts, nonprofit private organizations, public groups.....	11,000,000
Special centers for research and development.....	Conduct research on major problems of education.....	Colleges, universities, agencies, and organizations.....	10,800,000
Educational media research and demonstration.....	Support research on educational uses of television, radio, motion pictures, and other media.....	Grants: public or nonprofit institutions, individuals; contracts: private organizations, individuals.....	4,400,000
Library research and demonstration.....	Support research and demonstrations on libraries and library personnel training.....	Colleges, universities, agencies, and organizations.....	3,550,000
Foreign language research.....	Support research on improved instruction in modern foreign languages and materials development.....	Colleges, universities, public and private organizations, and individuals.....	3,000,000
Educational research (demonstration and development).....	Support development and demonstration of educational materials, processes, and organizational arrangements at all levels.....	Colleges, universities, state education agencies, private or public groups, or individuals.....	3,000,000
Educational resources information center (dissemination of research).....	Provide for dissemination of research findings to the educational community.....	do.....	2,400,000
			95,317,000
Grand total, 111 programs.....			4,214,239,165 (71,042,983)

On Justice and Peace in Vietnam

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, a most serious reappraisal of the bombardment of North Vietnam by the United States has been called for in a resolution by the general synod of the United Church of Christ.

The resolution calls on the American and North Vietnamese Governments "at the same time" to stop sending additional troops into South Vietnam.

Both Governments are urged to "manifest a readiness to participate in a political settlement of the war" and respond to efforts toward negotiation by the United Nations Secretary General and other governments.

"More resolute pursuit" of political, social, and economic development of South Vietnam is also urged.

The United Church delegates have called on "all parties" to permit the International Red Cross or International Control Commission to inspect the treatment of prisoners and arrange for exchange of prisoners.

Every pastor and every congregation of the United Church of Christ is urged to make the struggle for justice and peace a genuine priority in their common life, through:

Study, discussion, and action on the issues of the Vietnam war;

Concern for and communication with men and women in the Armed Forces and civilian services in Vietnam and elsewhere overseas;

Concern for conscientious objectors;

Programs for young people on the "issues of Christian conscience" involved;

"Generous and sacrificial" contributions for aid to the Vietnamese people on all sides of the conflict;

"Continual and special prayers" for peace; and

Interfaith and communitywide action in support of "every genuine possibility" for an end to the Vietnam war.

I hope that my colleagues in the Congress will give serious attention to this resolution that has been prepared for the more than 2 million members of the United Church of Christ. With that in mind, I extend my remarks with the complete statement. It follows:

ON JUSTICE AND PEACE IN VIETNAM

God judges and will judge the guilt of men and nations for the tragedy of war in Vietnam. Colonial powers will be judged for their oppression of the people of Vietnam. Judgment will reckon with those who seek to impose their will through terror and violence and who seek to establish tyranny under the guise of "wars of liberation." But judgment will also fall upon those who, professing the high purposes of freedom and self-determination, frustrate these very purposes through destructive and cruel means.

It is troubled opinion of the General Synod of the United Church of Christ that all parties are increasingly resorting to military means which retard the possibilities for genuine progress and peace in Vietnam, which obscure the fundamental needs of the people

of Vietnam, and which conceal the issues at stake in the present strife. The mind of America is not unanimous in this opinion. The views of church members themselves are divided. But we cannot permit the ambiguity of guilt or the diversity of opinion to silence our speaking to our government and to the citizens of our own nation, particularly the members of the United Church of Christ. Our democratic traditions allow it; our faith and moral commitments demand it.

We are mindful that the General Synod of 1965 supported "the position of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the effect that only political and diplomatic methods of negotiation and discussion can find a peaceful solution" to the Vietnam war and that "means must be found within or outside the United Nations of shifting the quest for a solution away from the field of battle to the conference room." This conviction and this hope have been overtaken by the events of the past two years.

There has been an expansion of military force and violence on all sides. United States action has steadily escalated through a series of military and political steps, each one apparently considered by the Administration to be prudent in its own limitations yet altogether leading to a much wider and costlier war.

There have been hundreds of thousands of casualties among the armed forces of all belligerents and the civilian population of Vietnam.

There has been an increasing apprehension over the risk of nuclear war.

There has been a deterioration in the prospects for a more thoroughgoing East-West detente.

There has been a serious gap between the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the United States government, and other belligerents over the Secretary-General's initiatives in the pursuit of peace.

There has been a sacrifice of some of this nation's greatest assets, including much of its esteem as a humane and peace-loving people, its credibility as between aims and actions, and its will to achieve social justice at home and abroad.

In sorrow and in moral anguish, we seek now to give voice to the church's witness to justice and peace in the present situation.

We believe that there has been an unrewarding and increasing preoccupation with military assaults upon North Vietnam. There is no meaningful prospect for solving the most basic Vietnamese problems through the pursuit of military victory in the North.

We continue to support a negotiated settlement of the war consonant with justice and security for the people of Vietnam. Where formal negotiations may not prove feasible, we believe that deliberate acts of restraint and renunciation may serve to mitigate the violence on both sides and to encourage the beginnings of a minimal trust without which no political settlement can succeed. With regard to the governments and the United Nations we must affirm that "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind" is surely an important guide to national policy.

We must not raise false hopes concerning an early end to revolutionary struggle and violent warfare in Vietnam. While remaining open to every promise of resolution of the conflict, we must resist the temptation to believe that the war can be ended quickly through massive military attacks, or through any single act of deescalation, or through every reported "peace feeler." The tragic truth in Vietnam is that there may be many months if not years of relentless conflict no matter what policy choices are made by the United States government.

Yet our acknowledgment of the possibility of a protracted struggle must not serve to make us complacent with regard to

military means. We must constantly keep the use of violence under moral scrutiny. We must reject and condemn any indiscriminate resort to weapons such as napalm and fragmentation bombs which have so frequently led to the killing and maiming of civilians and the destruction of their homes.

We affirm the profound yearning of the Vietnamese people on all sides of the present conflict to achieve peaceful development within the framework of regional cooperation and security in Southeast Asia. We must be prepared to give effective support to generous United States participation in regional economic assistance.

We cannot expect Vietnamese political institutions to pattern themselves upon our own governmental experience in the United States. Nevertheless, we must recognize and encourage those tendencies within Vietnamese political life which promise a larger measure of civic freedom, popular representation, and the rule of law.

In the light of these concerns, we urge the following actions for the sake of justice and peace in Vietnam:

I. We urge the most serious reappraisal of United States air, naval, and artillery bombardment of North Vietnam and the more resolute pursuit of political development, economic justice, and social reconstruction in South Vietnam.

II. At the same time we call upon the governments of North Vietnam and the United States to cease their dispatch of further forces to South Vietnam and to manifest a readiness to participate in a political settlement of the war, including a responsiveness to the initiative of the United Nations Secretary-General and of other governments.

III. We call upon all parties to permit the International Red Cross or the International Control Commission to make inspection of the treatment of prisoners and to make arrangements for the exchange of prisoners.

IV. We appeal for immediate planning and adequate implementation providing for a program of economic and social reconstruction for all of Southeast Asia, including both South and North Vietnam, in accordance with the President's proposed one-billion dollar project for establishment of a Mekong Valley Authority.

Finally, in the spirit of the "Appeal to the Churches Concerning Vietnam" adopted by the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches on December 9, 1966, we commend every pastor and every congregation of the United Church of Christ the following actions as an expression of their willingness to make "the struggle for justice and peace" a genuine priority in our common life:

1. Congregational study, discussion, and action concerning the issues which we have set forth in this resolution.

2. Pastoral concern for and regular communication with men and women serving in the Armed Forces and civilian services in Vietnam and elsewhere overseas.

3. Pastoral concern for and regular communication with those who have chosen to witness as conscientious objectors.

4. Programs in which the issues of Christian conscience in relation to war and peace, the draft, and military service may be lifted up for the young people of our congregations who are faced with personal decisions in these matters.

5. Generous and sacrificial contributions to the Vietnam Christian Service program and to other ministries of service and healing to the Vietnamese people on all sides of the conflict.

6. Continual and special prayers and worship in which justice, compassion, and peace in Vietnam and the United States are the central concern.

7. Congregational involvement in interfaith and communitywide action in support of every genuine possibility for lifting from the long-suffering Vietnamese people the scourge of war which has been their sorrow for many generations.

The Bright Hope of Neighborhood Health Centers

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the neighborhood health center program is emerging as one of the most promising new efforts undertaken by the Office of Economic Opportunity. These centers are one phase of the total antipoverty program that would benefit from the \$200 million OEO supplemental appropriation proposed by 38 Congressmen last week. OEO had hoped to have 50 centers in operation by the end of the year, but recent budget cutbacks are delaying the opening of the nine new centers that were to have gone into operation during 1968.

The March 21 issue of the Reporter describes the operation of these centers in the following article:

THE BRIGHT PROMISE OF NEIGHBORHOOD HEALTH CENTERS

(By Judith Randal)

Of all the innovations put forward by the Office of Economic Opportunity in its fight against poverty, the one that perhaps will eventually accomplish the most is its relatively recent Neighborhood Health Center program. If Project Head Start was the first to catch the public's fancy, the Health Center idea is likely to be of more direct benefit to the poor.

Medical reformers have been aware for some time that as medical discovery and technology have leaped ahead, the profession has become fragmented into isolated specialties with steadily costlier treatment often subordinate to research. Despite growing reliance on government-supported programs such as Medicaid and Medicare, medicine's ability to deliver care to the whole community has not kept pace with the high quality of service it can provide the relatively few. Obviously, no group suffers more from this than the poor. Statistics reveal that the poor have more heart disease, more rheumatoid arthritis, more unrehabilitated injury, more mental illness, more tuberculosis, more of almost every illness whether chronic or acute, and higher death rates in all age groups than do Americans at large. Yet the more that is known about the treatment of any disorder, the greater the likelihood that this knowledge is not benefiting the poor.

Illness—or even lack of well-being—and poverty go hand in hand. It is axiomatic that the poor get sicker and the sick get poorer. To break this cycle, since 1966 OEO has offered grants to Community Action agencies, hospitals, medical schools, health departments, medical societies, and other public or nonprofit agencies interested in setting up and operating neighborhood centers "for the development of comprehensive health services for the poor." OEO does not initiate or operate the projects; it selects from among many offered for its approval, provides money and administrative guid-

ance, and sets up broad goals and specific standards. Beyond that, each center is left to make its own decisions and launch its own projects.

UNDER ONE ROOF

One major difference between OEO centers and existing clinics lies in the phrase "comprehensive health services." The patient is treated not only for specific illnesses; the idea is, as much as possible, to prevent illness and maintain a high degree of health. Another difference is that the OEO centers are run for the convenience of the patients rather than for that of the people who provide the care. There is no need for several members of a family to go from one special clinic to another—all facilities are under one roof. Members of the same family are treated in relation to one another, and patients' medical and other problems are considered and tackled together.

The emphasis is on finding those who need help rather than putting up barriers to help. Initially, care is provided without question. Emergency care is always provided. Whether or not a family is entitled to continuing free medical care is determined by the center's administrators and OEO's eligibility requirements. (Under the OEO poverty standard, an urban family of four must earn less than \$3,200 a year.) In narrowing the choice from among many eligible families, the administrators depend heavily on the views of the Neighborhood Health Council, composed of representatives of those eligible for service and, in most cases, health professionals and other community leaders. Neighborhood workers actually seek out people who will not or cannot come on their own; if transportation or baby sitters are needed, they are supplied. In no case are patients forced through the humiliation of welfare investigations.

Instead of keeping only daytime hours, which mean sacrifices in time and money for many patients. Neighborhood Health Centers are open evenings and weekends; they offer appointments rather than endless waits. Whereas most public facilities are impersonal and dismal, with doctors seeing patients in turn and at random, Health Center patrons may choose a physician and see him regularly in "doctor's office" surroundings. Typically each family chooses the doctor, nurse, and other health worker whom it sees on every visit, although family members will see specialists when necessary.

No one center exactly resembles another. Physically, they range from Watts' brand-new \$1.5 million building to Mound Bayou, Mississippi's, temporary quarters in an abandoned church, a movie theatre, two former stores, and a trailer. They differ considerably, too, in number of patients. The Columbia Point Center in Boston, the earliest, treats only the residents of one housing project; an OEO grant has been given to another center that will draw families from five counties in Michigan. All are staffed with at least an internist, an obstetrician, a pediatrician, and a dentist, supplemented by part-time specialists and supporting personnel including trained residents of the neighborhood.

All Health Centers, according to OEO ground rules, rely as much as possible on the poor themselves to perform a host of necessary tasks. They are trained for a wide variety of occupations, many of which are undermanned in the nation as a whole. Family health workers, home health and laboratory aides, physicians' and nurses' assistants—these are just a few of the categories destined to help the poor help themselves and others. Contact with doctors and other Health Center professionals, OEO officials think, may even encourage underprivileged young people to try for medical and other health careers.

Neighborhood Health Centers are equipped for emergencies but do not have hospital

beds. Each center is allied with a local hospital and sends patients there for surgery or other in-hospital care. For this service, as for any other service provided eligible patients, the centers are reimbursed if a Federal, state, or private agency would normally foot the bill. If no such agency is involved, the center itself pays for care. Just as the family's chosen doctor assumes overall responsibility for his patients' health, the center attends to all the interagency red tape and paper work that must be coped with, relieving patients of tasks that are beyond them. The total average cost per patient is about \$120 a year.

Centers are located in city neighborhoods or rural areas that doctors in private practice have found unrewarding. In Watts, for example, before the Health Center opened in the fall of 1967, there was one doctor for every 2,900 persons and the nearest hospital was twelve miles distant. In urban areas where the poor often flock to hospital emergency rooms with every kind of complaint rather than wait hours in special clinics, many hospitals have taken the initiative and sought OEO help in setting up Neighborhood Health Centers, lending staff members to the project. In rural areas, it has often been doctors in group practice who have initiated centers.

TWO APPROACHES, ONE PROBLEM

At the start of this year, thirteen centers, nine in the big cities and four in rural areas, were in full operation; nine others were offering services to a limited number of people, and nineteen more have been given grants but were not yet open. Two centers that were authorized simultaneously under the auspices of Tufts University Medical School—one at the Columbia Point public housing project in Dorchester, Massachusetts, the other in Mound Bayou, Mississippi—serve to illustrate the program.

The Columbia Point housing project is austere, cut off from the mainstream of Boston life. For 150 years the site was Boston's city dump. Since 1953 its dingy brick apartment buildings have been home to 1,500 families or a total of about six thousand people.

Superficially, it is entirely different from rural Mound Bayou, a community of 1,200 Negro sharecroppers in the heart of the Delta. But below the surface, Mound Bayou and the Negro slums of the North share a common background of misery. As machines and weed-killing chemicals have replaced black hands on Southern plantations, 200,000 Negroes have been moving north and west each year, bringing with them a melancholy inventory of want, ignorance, and disease. Although disadvantaged Negroes are not the only ones to benefit from the new health care—Columbia Point is not entirely Negro; poor whites in Appalachia, migrant workers of Mexican extraction, and Indians in Minnesota are also receiving attention—Negroes are by far the most numerous and most typical of the program's beneficiaries.

In the development of their health programs, Columbia Point and Mound Bayou have followed disparate paths determined largely by local attitudes. From the time of its inception two years ago, the Dorchester project has had all the advantages in terms of support from government and professional groups. As a result, service was started six months after the OEO grant was awarded.

Of the six thousand residents in the Columbia Point housing project, 5,324 are patients of the center. Three family-care teams—internist, pediatrician, health workers and other supporting personnel—have been set up. The center has the most up-to-date equipment for ambulatory care, including a computerized record system. A neighborhood immunization program is almost complete. A particularly active health council has been created in a community

where no organized activity existed before. It has not only taken an increasingly strong role in planning and administering health care but has gone on to initiate programs for older people and youth groups and has helped to familiarize project residents with other community resources.

An initial survey based on the health records of fifty-four apparently typical Columbia Point families reveals that since they have been under the care of the center, hospitalization of family members has dropped eighty per cent. In part, this is due to the fact that health problems are often treated before they get serious enough to require hospitalization, and in part it is because home-care and neighborhood workers are able to make patients comfortable in their own homes.

At Mound Bayou, by contrast, establishment of a health-care center has been a long, uphill fight. Here the reaction of public officials and medical authorities ranged from indifference to outright hostility. The official line seemed—indeed at times was stated openly—to be that the Negroes of Bolivar County neither needed nor deserved medical attention and that the whole scheme was just more Yankee carpetbagging. Even the Negro fraternal burial societies slowed the efforts of the OEO.

According to a Department of Labor estimate, more than sixty per cent of Bolivar County's Negroes now have no work at all. Many get no relief payments and are too poor to buy the Federal food stamps that are worth twenty or thirty times their cash value in surplus food.

Malnutrition is a serious problem. Infant mortality is another. Ninety-eight per cent of white mothers are attended by a doctor at delivery; only fifty-five per cent of the Negroes are. For Bolivar County's 19,000 whites there are nineteen doctors; for 40,000 Negroes there are only three. The doctor-to-patient ratio in the county is half of Mississippi's average, which in turn is half the national average. The county has maintained a small but active health department. But with an annual budget of only \$70,000 and just six public-health nurses (none Negro), it has offered only limited care and little doctor service. Tufts University expected and found an abundance of undetected, neglected disease and a backlog of uncorrected birth defects and unrehabilitated injury among the poor of Bolivar County.

Two Negro beneficial groups, the United Order of Friendship and the Knights & Daughters of Tabor, had built small "hospitals" at the end of the Second World War. They were utterly inadequate to the needs of Bolivar County Negroes; but they had been established after herculean efforts by their sponsors, and even though they were on the verge of bankruptcy, they were sold only reluctantly to the Mound Bayou Community Hospital Association through a separate grant arranged by OEO. The hospitals have been merged and are now being modernized.

Operating under the sponsorship of Tufts and the direction of Drs. Jack Geiger and Count Gibson, who had set up the Columbia Point center, the Mound Bayou center now has two pediatricians and three other doctors on its staff as well as the part-time services of Bolivar County's three Negro doctors. The Health Center's facilities are makeshift: one church serves as a clinic and another as staff offices, a movie theatre as a classroom for health-care trainees. (There were 982 applications for thirty trainee jobs when the center opened in November.) A prefabricated building will be set up this spring. By the time it is ready for use, the health center's present daily case load of sixty patients is expected to double or triple. OEO expects eventually that the center will serve 14,000 people.

In a county where 42,000 people come from families that live on less than \$3,000 a year and where some are actually starving, the

poor themselves decide who are the very neediest. It is also in such a situation that the comprehensiveness of the Health Center concept is shown at its sharpest. A half-starved child with pneumonia may need penicillin but he also needs food. Mound Bayou's doctors must provide both.

If the health benefits that accrue from the Mound Bayou center are obvious, certain other implications are not. The Health Center staff, with OEO assistance, will also try to help people in Bolivar County to improve their housing, to establish a co-operative to raise and can foods (a farmer has donated the use of a hundred acres of land), and perhaps to open a small factory. The center is running a formal part-time program whereby high-school and junior-college students may get preliminary medical training. The outcome of these efforts is uncertain, but on other scores, at least, two indications of progress are evident.

One is that skilled Southern-born Negro professionals have been willing to return, not merely, as Dr. Geiger said, to give service, but also to provide disheartened people with living examples of what might be possible even for them.

A second is that other Southern states that have been watching events in Bolivar County are displaying a willingness—even an eagerness—for home-grown comprehensive health services of the OEO sort. Lowndes County, Alabama, is a typical case. An area described as "virtually without medical resources," it has received a Neighborhood Health Center planning grant to be administered by the county board of health. The board along with the state university medical school and the state health department, has begun the preliminaries necessary before services can be begun. So eager was Alabama to get started on this project that Governor Lurleen Wallace, away in Houston, Texas, for cancer treatment, had the necessary papers rushed to her hospital bedside for signature. A similar project is being considered for Montgomery, the state capital.

PRESCRIPTION FOR CHANGE

Many observers believe that Neighborhood Health Centers, if built in sufficient numbers throughout the country, might eventually effect a change in many aspects of the nation's system for delivery of medical care. Indeed, the National Advisory Commission on Health Manpower suggested in its report last November that the national health-care apparatus is more mishmash than system: "... a collection of bits and pieces [characterized by] overlapping, duplication, great gaps, high costs, and wasted effort." Daniel Zwick an OEO official, states the problem in these simple terms: "With medicine one of the most highly organized segments of American society and poor consumers among the least, redressing the balance without scaring the doctors away is by no means an easy task."

Zwick sees in the Neighborhood Health Center a tool for making badly needed changes in the way of delivering health services. Many hospital administrators, he points out, are aware that their outpatient services—frequent targets of social criticism—are inadequate. These hospital managers have often been powerless to rearrange priorities so as to give more attention to the needs of outpatients. OEO may turn out to be just the sort of leverage they need. Dr. Paul Torrens, director of community medicine at St. Luke's Hospital Center in New York, three years ago saw money earmarked for a badly needed rehabilitation service snatched away to outfit an open-heart surgery suite, despite the fact that New York City was already oversupplied. Now Torrens has received a \$939,402 grant to open a Neighborhood Health Center under St. Luke's auspices.

The OEO Health Centers are also forcing local medical societies and health depart-

ments into new professional and social patterns and causing them to accept roles they never would have considered in the past. One example is to be found in Atlanta, where the local Community Action agency, Economic Opportunity Atlanta, Inc., has turned over health-care programming to the Fulton County Medical Society and the Medical School of Emory University. Along similar lines, in the farming community of King City, California, the Monterey County Medical Society is directly involved in the provision of OEO-sponsored health care to indigent people of the area. And in Denver, the city Department of Health and Hospitals has assumed responsibility for two centers, one serving a predominantly Negro area on the east side, the other a Mexican-American west side neighborhood.

Perhaps more significant than any of these developments is the profound influence OEO's Health Center concept seems to be exerting on the nation's medical schools and on the direction of their graduates' careers. For years now, most of these institutions have almost deliberately isolated themselves from the community. Most young doctors have headed either for the research laboratory or the suburbs where a comfortable practice could be staked out in respectable surroundings. Working among the poor was not only frustrating financially but professionally as well. The cost and complication of scientific advances made it virtually impossible for individual practitioners to deliver modern medical care in the slums.

With the advent of OEO Health Centers and the involvement up to now of twenty medical schools in the experiment, both faculty and students have been undergoing a change of heart. The University of Southern California School of Medicine, for example, not only co-operated successfully with the Neighborhood Health Council of nearby Watts in setting up a center, but when Congress delayed in voting funds for the poverty program last fall, the USC medical school came voluntarily to the rescue. Without assurance that it would be repaid, the school advanced enough money to keep the Health Center going.

Other medical schools seem willing to run this sort of risk. About half of those in the country have participated in developing proposals for OEO funds, recognizing that comprehensive health programs not only do a great deal for the poor but also do something for doctors in training.

There is a widespread opinion in medical-education circles these days that the carefully selected cases seen by students in teaching hospitals are hardly typical of the spectrum of ills afflicting America. "Only in the community can a more random selection of health problems be found and early stages of illness studied and cared for..." wrote Robert J. Haggerty, professor of pediatrics at the University of Rochester, in the January issue of the *New England Journal of Medicine*. "To achieve this goal of a realistic setting, a defined and known population is needed—a parish for which a clinical department or a university can be responsible, to know who its patients are and who does not now receive adequate care."

It is to be expected, of course, that not everyone shares the high-minded outlook of a medical academician like Haggerty, and indeed much discussion of the OEO program within the health profession has been couched in terms of whose ox is being gored. The pharmacists are often worried about competition, and at the recent AMA-sponsored National Conference on Health Care for the Poor, for example, there was concern for preserving the right of the underprivileged to "free choice of physician"—despite the fact that this choice is largely fictional. At the same conference, AMA President Milford Rouse cautioned the participants not to over-

look the thousand health-care programs currently administered by 175 public and private agencies, and in effect warned OEO not to try to become the 176th—a warning hardly called for in light of the poverty agency's record of attempting to fill vacuums rather than engage in competition with existing health services.

Nonetheless, things are taking shape. President Johnson has recommended that \$60 million of the OEO budget be spent on Neighborhood Health Centers. The goal is to have fifty centers going by the end of this year. Even this amount would be capable of helping only a small fraction of the poor—and the poor are not the only Americans whose health care could stand improvement. (In order to meet the needs of the poor alone, it is estimated that 850 health centers throughout the country would be needed.) Supporters of OEO are confident, however, that no matter how many centers are established, their numbers are less important than the chain reaction this social experiment will set off.

The President's Conservation Message

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, it is late, but not too late, to stop the needless and often reckless pollution of our environment. This is the central thought contained in President Johnson's conservation message. The President rightly believes that it is not too late to start restoring the natural beauty and purity of the air, the water, and the soil.

President Johnson's message on environmental health is a reminder to the Congress and the public that there is still time to take strong and prompt action to reverse the trend toward pollution of our environment.

The increasing attention being paid to these problems can be attributed to three main factors: the explosive increase in the number of people occupying a limited space; the accumulated effects of our past inaction, which are becoming so great that we cannot ignore them; and the increased technological capabilities which promise an ability, previously beyond our reach, to arrest this decline. The operation of these factors is particularly evident in regard to the problems of air pollution.

More people, engaged in more activities, result in the production of more air contaminants; past inaction has led to a situation where the existence of "smog" and the occurrence of air pollution emergencies have become increasingly ominous in too many parts of our country; and new technology offers us ways of controlling discharges or eliminating them. Under the Clean Air Act of 1963, and its amendments of 1965 and 1966, the Nation was attempting to tackle these problems of air pollution. But it became obvious that more far-reaching legislation was required if we were to be successful. Thus, last session the Congress passed the Air Quality Act of 1967 in order to provide bold new mechanisms for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to work in cooperation with the States and local governments.

The administration has begun to carry out this new legislation in an aggressive and efficient manner. The President's message describes some of the activities which are now underway. But such activities, in order to be effective, require sufficient funding. How else can the American people be assured that the Air Quality Act will be adequately administered? How else can they be assured that research will continue, so that technology may be developed to solve the problems of pollution? How else can they be assured that control activities will be aggressive?

I hope all Members will examine the President's message with the care it deserves, and heed its call to action; I hope all Members will join with me in support of his requests for funds to implement the promising new legislation we enacted last year.

Secretary Weaver Discusses Major Problems of Housing in Cities

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Indianapolis was honored recently by the appearance of Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

He came to Indianapolis in connection with the annual dinner meeting of the Marion County Young Democrats.

At that time, he made an excellent address on the subject of "Major Problems of Housing in Cities," and I insert at this point in the Record the text of his remarks:

It is good to be here in Indianapolis and look out from this podium and see nothing but friendly faces. With Congressional hearings about to begin in Washington, I will be spending a good deal of time in the near future testifying before various committees. This may be the last totally friendly audience I talk to in the next few weeks.

But that reminds that one can never be sure. At a Republican reception in Washington the other day, one of the leaders of that other party looked around the room and said to a newspaper reporter: "Some of these people are known Democrats."

That's pretty harsh language.

It falls in the category of what British historian Denis Brogan said in commenting on the American character: "Any well-established village in New England or the northern Middle West could afford a town drunkard, a town atheist, and a few Democrats."

I think Mr. Brogan may have underestimated the Democrats of the Middle West. Andy Jacobs is living proof that somebody gets to the polls on election day and votes for a known Democrat. And that is going to happen again in 1968.

We are meeting today in a period of vast urban growth and accelerating social change. The interaction of these two elements, sometimes meshing and sometimes clashing, has given us a period during which there was a good deal of progress, but also more than our share of conflict and confusion.

Consequently, we find these contrasting situations which President Johnson pointed out in his State of the Union Message:

Our economy has created 7½ million new

jobs in the past four years, is adding more than a million and half a year, and recent surveys showed unemployment to be at the lowest level in many years.

But—there are still some half a million hard-core unemployed in the major cities of this Nation, and the non-white unemployment rate sometimes runs three or four times higher than the average.

The number of our citizens living in poverty has decreased some 6½ million during this administration.

But—29 million Americans still live below the poverty line, and there are still nearly 6 million substandard housing units occupied in this country.

The President said: "All about them, most American families can see the evidence of a growing abundance. Higher paychecks; humming factories; new cars moving down new highways. More and more families own their own homes, equipped with more than 70 million television sets. A new college is founded every week. Today more than half of the high school graduates go on to college."

But—the President also noted that crime is increasing on our streets, and new housing construction is far less than we need, that violence has shown its face in some of our cities, and that many rivers—and the air in many cities—remain badly polluted.

And the President noted that although we have lived with these conditions for many years, and once accepted them as inevitable, we now find them absolutely intolerable.

This is the pattern among nonwhites, also. They have been poor and discriminated against for centuries—"the bitter consequences of three centuries," as the President put it—but the people who once accepted this situation as inevitable, now find it intolerable.

So we have our jobs cut out for us today. But then let's look at the future.

We must provide housing and education and jobs for 100 million new urban Americans by the close of this century.

We must revitalize our central cities and rehabilitate hundreds of thousands of our citizens so they may both share in and contribute to American society.

We must plan and implement urban growth, both in existing cities and in new population centers. And that means planning and installing thousands of miles of transit lines and highways, and of sewer and water lines, and allowing decent open spaces for parks and playgrounds.

In the next ten years alone we must build and rehabilitate housing at about 2½ millions units a year if we are to meet our needs.

The first question is, can we do all these things? Can we rebuild and revitalize cities which have been deteriorating for decades? Can we erase the scars of three centuries of neglect of our nonwhite citizens? Can we mount the effort we must have to meet the inevitable growth of an urban Nation?

My answer to that is a simple one. Yes, we can.

We have the economic muscle, and the productive capacity to meet both the requirements of rehabilitation and growth. We have a reservoir of good will among our citizens, black and white, that is more than sufficient to handle the bigotry of the extremists if it can be revitalized by successes that require significant action. We have enough innovative capacity and initiative among our people to cope with both change and growth.

The real question then is a matter of will. Will we recognize the complexity of our urban problems, and arrange our priorities to meet them?

Will we mobilize our economic power and industrial might to meet the physical requirements of building and rehabilitation?

Will we draw on our resources of tolerance and decency and give the kind of realistic help needed to act as an antidote to violence in our streets?

And there, I cannot give an answer.

The answer lies within this room and within this city. It lies within the mayor's office, and in the governor's suite. It lies with the businessman, the union man, the city councilman, and the teacher. All of us must be involved. All of us are involved. We can no more escape our urban destiny than we can escape drawing the next breath.

The order of past and present growth, and the dimensions of future problems are known to all of you in this room. We have come from an essentially rural to become an urban nation within the lifetimes of most of us in this audience. Indianapolis and the State of Indiana are no exceptions. The city has grown and the suburbs have grown even faster. You have problems of poverty and blight and urban ghettos here, as do most of our larger and many of our smaller cities.

Tonight I have selected housing as a measuring rod by which we can gauge many of our urban problems. This is not because we can ignore the other hardware of urban development—transit systems, and commercial and industrial building, public facilities and schools. Nor can we ignore the need for more jobs and more health and family counseling services and the rehabilitation of people.

But in housing we have the most personal of physical structures, the symbol most of us equate with the human necessities of shelter and pride and the environment we want for our children.

Of course, housing does not stand alone. Time after time we have heard parents from urban ghettos ask for those things that all parents want for their families: clean streets and good playgrounds and schools in neighborhoods that are safe and in which they can take pride.

Also they want the option of raising their families in the suburbs if they feel like it. Nothing can be more American than that. And nothing today can be considered more un-American than the fact that this option is still denied most nonwhite families in most of urban America.

The Administration and the Congress have taken significant action to end many of the inequities which isolated our nonwhite citizens in the past. The last major bastion of bigotry in our country is the existence of the white suburban noose around many of our cities. A Federal law to end that situation is a necessary and proper next step, and the President has given his complete support to this move, which he describes as "a crucial arena for human rights."

Whatever the outcome of this legislation, however, I do not believe we should hold back any of our programs only on the strange concept that making bad neighborhoods into better places to live is going to institutionalize existing patterns of racial segregation.

This is an area in which I have a fundamental disagreement with some of the critics of our urban programs.

As a matter of fact, I suspect that many critics of the so-called gilded-ghetto concept have in fact seized upon a handy and colorful phrase to support their own honest and compassionate sentiments against housing segregation.

My point and the point of the Administration's strong commitment to improve low- and moderate-income housing during the next decade, is that we must get all of our people into the best housing we can in the best neighborhoods we know how to build as rapidly as possible.

And no one can convince me that within this decade we are going to improve Harlem and Hough and Watts and all our other ghettos to the extent that they can possibly be characterized as "gilded."

The real solution, and the one I believe most people of good will support, is that the rebuilding and rehabilitation of all the blighted and seriously deficient parts of the

city should go ahead at the same time that artificial racial barriers come down in the suburbs. And they must come down.

The President's messages of this year—in the State of the Union, in the budget, in the Housing Message—all signal an escalation of effort to upgrade the quality of urban life. Specifically our major concern is with the volume of this effort. And volume is the key word.

This is why the President in his Housing Message called upon the Nation to build 26 million units of housing during the next 10 years, and to rehabilitate another 2 million units, the most dramatic and ambitious housing program ever projected for this country.

Six million units of this housing will be Federally-assisted housing for low- and moderate-income families, 300,000 to be started this first year. Contrast this with some 530,000 starts in the last 10 years, and you have some idea of the jump in volume.

Much of this housing will be built under the existing programs of the public housing and rent supplement programs, which I will discuss later. Some will be produced by a new interest subsidy program for moderate-income rental housing. But there will also be an innovative new home ownership program in which low- and moderate-income families can purchase housing at a cost they can afford to pay and with the interest rate on their mortgages subsidized down to 1 percent if necessary.

The President is asking for more than housing in his new legislative program, however.

He has called upon the Congress to modify the traditional urban renewal program so that a project can be planned and executed segment by segment, rather than all at one time. This will permit a city to start earlier, proceed faster, and carry out a project more in keeping with the needs of the residents in the area to be renewed.

He has called for a new kind of cooperative program for insurance protection for those core city areas where property risks have been so high that insurance was either difficult or impossible to find. This would involve a partnership of Federal and State governments with the insurance industry, and it would include protection from the results of civil disorder.

He has also recommended a new financing program under which this Nation can begin the vitally-necessary process of developing new communities to meet our expanding urban growth. This would involve a Federally-guaranteed "cash flow" debenture which would protect the investor, and at the same time free the developer from making large debt payments until he has a cash flow from the sale of developed land.

Finally, the President's proposals would create a new partnership between private enterprise and government, so that this Nation can turn its industrial might to the housing dilemmas of poor Americans. By pooling investments, by spreading risks, by tax incentives, and by developing management skills, we believe a National Housing Partnership can tap new resources and create new potentials.

This is a volume program. It is an imaginative program. And given the means and a strong national purpose, we can, as the President asked "change the face of our cities and end the fear of those—rich and poor alike—who call them home."

The legislative and administrative machinery we will use to bring about this volume of new housing is a measure, I believe, of the whole improvement of Federal urban efforts during the life of this Administration.

On the legislative side, we already have two major new programs:

Rent supplements, a program which for the first time permits private corporations to build or rehabilitate housing for very low-income groups—those who are eligible for

low-rent public housing. These private groups also select the tenants and manage this housing.

The model cities program, which will combine a number of existing Federal programs, as well as State, local and private efforts, to improve whole major slum neighborhoods. Sixty-three cities are now planning their model cities programs, and we will soon announce planning grants for an additional 70 or so cities.

Along with activating these new programs, we have vastly improved some of our traditional Federal programs through a change in the structure and administrative functions of HUD. After two years as a department, we have brought forth a far more efficient and people-oriented agency to meet the need of our cities and of our needy citizens.

In public housing, for example, we are now encouraging low-rise and scattered-site units placed in heterogeneous neighborhoods. This will help to break the pattern of the segregated, monolithic projects of the past. We are also acquiring and rehabilitating good existing housing for low-income families, and calling for better community and social services. We are giving more responsibility to the private builder in our turnkey programs. This is a system whereby a private contractor designs and builds a project on a site of his selection, and turns the keys of the finished structure over to the local housing authority on completion.

Under turnkey, we are experimenting in private management of public housing, and in allowing tenants to attain eventual ownership through their own efforts.

The urban renewal program has been drastically reorganized so that it will be far more responsive to the needs of low-income and essentially residential neighborhoods. We are emphasizing the conservation and rehabilitation of housing, rather than clearance programs. We are encouraging new enterprises that produce jobs in urban renewal project areas.

The Federal Housing Administration has made a dramatic change in emphasis from almost purely suburban to central city and slum building. FHA is now approving 1,000 mortgage insurance applications a week from buyers in city neighborhoods where risks had formerly been considered prohibitive. This is a hundred times more than the figures for just one year ago. In addition, FHA is actively seeking customers from low-income families through counseling services. These services direct families to decent housing, and, in fact, have become involved in many kinds of peripheral activities which are very helpful to low-income families. A number of new cities will be getting these counseling service offices in the near future.

This is only a sampling of the changes taking place in HUD. We are, for example, more and more involved in experiments to improve the techniques of building low-income housing. We are organizing what will be a truly significant urban institute, something we need desperately in this country. In our urban development programs, we are helping our expanding urban regions anticipate and guide the challenges of growth.

I would remind you that I have emphasized only the Federal programs so far. As always, however, it must be the private sector of the economy that does the vast percentage of building and rebuilding in this Nation's cities and urban areas.

Here, too, the progress of the past few years has been phenomenal. The private insurance companies of this country have pledged \$1 billion to support the housing and other needs of our slums, and a good deal of that money is now at work. There is an Urban Coalition of nation leaders who are turning their considerable talents to meeting the needs of the urban poor. And local urban coalitions are springing up in many of our major cities. And there is the

Administration's proposal for a National Housing Partnership.

This, then, is the tone of the Administration's urban housing strategy. Through the addition of major new programs, and through an ever-changing, ever more sophisticated use of existing legislation, we have developed an urban program of genuine value. If we will use these tools properly we can make good on the President's pledge to urban America:

"Until each city is a community where every member feels he belongs, until it is a place where each citizen feels safe on his street, until it is a place where self-respect and dignity are the lot of each man—we will not rest."

I needn't remind this audience that these things have come about during a Democratic administration, and with the dedicated support of such urban-oriented Congressmen as Andy Jacobs.

We have had bi-partisan support, of course, from a small and courageous band of urban Republicans. But still we had 82 percent of Senate Republicans and 97 percent of their counterparts in the House against us on rent supplements, and last year 80 percent of Republican Congressmen voted to slash model cities funds.

It is men such as Andy Jacobs who have led the way in supporting the key programs so necessary to the future of our urban areas. And we will need such men more and more if we are to meet the challenge of our urban destiny.

U.S.S. "Pueblo" Forgotten?

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, many citizens of this great Nation feel a deep sense of shame and disgust at the inaction surrounding the *Pueblo* affair. It has now been almost 2 months since our men were seized, and virtually nothing has been accomplished to effect their release. North Korea committed an overt act of war against the United States. And we rather weakly try to negotiate, without so much as a deadline for the freedom of our men.

In Vietnam we are told that if we do not stand up and honor our commitments, our word will be meaningless throughout the world—and I agree. But what of the *Pueblo* and its crew? What of our commitments to our own seamen? What of the honor of our own flag on the high seas? What value will be our commitments to defend others if we seem unwilling or unable to defend our own?

I include a TV editorial further discussing this matter, broadcast by Bill Gordon of WPTV, Palm Beach, to be printed here in the RECORD:

THE BILL GORDON REPORT, MARCH 13, 1968

Seven weeks ago there was a great hue and cry over North Korea's seizure of the USS *Pueblo* . . . the death of one of its 83 crewmembers and the imprisonment of the rest. With great fanfare and urgency certain reserve forces were called to duty. From the highest official quarters the action of the North Koreans was described as "hostile" . . . "high-handed" . . . a "violation of International Law" . . . even as an "act of war".

These righteous and deserved cries . . . however . . . soon were stifled by so-called "voices of reason" with their usual and pre-

dictable handwringing pleas that cowardice disguised as reason prevail.

Well . . . they obviously won out. For when was the last time you heard anything about the USS *Pueblo* . . . and its crew? And . . . even more important . . . when was the last time they heard from the nation they swore to protect . . . but which seemingly is not willing to do more than talk at Panmunjom in their behalf.

These men have now spent 51 days in captivity . . . presumably unknowing if their government is even aware of their fate . . . or concerned. Exactly what they are experiencing we cannot know for sure . . . but from our knowledge of North Korean interrogation and coercion practices of the past . . . we can certainly guess at what tactics were employed to produce the apologies and confessions that have been displayed around the world as alleged "proof" of American aggression.

It's hardly comforting to accept the assurance of one Washington source of several weeks ago that . . . when the North Koreans have used these men to their satisfaction . . . they'll be freed.

We still insist that the oath the *Pueblo* crewmen took to protect this country means they are entitled to receive the same protection from this country.

But apparently that's an old fashioned concept. For now we live in an enlightened era where draftcard burners receive more legal protection and consideration than men who accept their obligations.

But those obligations should not include an understanding men will be abandoned and forgotten because their leaders lack the courage demanded of them.

Resolution by Illinois State Senate

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 4, 1968, the Illinois State Senate adopted a resolution introduced by State Senator Arthur R. Gottschalk, of the Illinois Eighth District, clearly expressing the views of the senate on the Blakey report. This action by the State senate relates directly to the impact that the report would have in criminal investigation activities in the State of Illinois. In view of the importance of this matter and the deliberate efforts of the administration to suppress the report, I feel that this resolution deserves the exposure that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD provides.

The resolution follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS, SENATE RESOLUTION 202
(Offered by Senator Gottschalk)

Whereas, the President of the United States established the Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice to study the causes of crime in the nation and to make recommendations on ways to combat crime and this 19-member Commission, supported by a staff of 63 and with the services of 175 consultants, did prepare and deliver its report to the President in early 1967; and

Whereas, the Commission recommended to the President as one of more than 200 official recommendations that "enforcement officials should provide regular briefings to leaders at all levels of government concerning organized crime conditions within the

jurisdiction" and concluded its report by stating: "(America) must recognize that the government of a free society is obliged to act not only effectively but fairly. It (America) must seek knowledge and admit mistakes"; and

Whereas, the Commission employed one Professor G. Robert Blakey, a member of the Notre Dame Law School faculty and a national authority on organized crime activities, who, in the course of his work as a consultant to the Commission, prepared a 63-page document or supplement, referred to in the press as the "Blakey Report", which purportedly treats in detail various unwholesome links between Mafia gangsters and Cook County political figures, judges and law enforcement personnel, and additionally, is reported to cite corrupt influences in the Illinois General Assembly;

Whereas, numerous press dispatches have said the "Blakey Report" has been deliberately suppressed because of possible embarrassment to those officeholders, Judges, political figures and legislators, so that honest officeholders and the public in general remain uninformed about the nature of the alleged corruption or the identity of those so charged, creating a haunting cloud of suspicion which besmirches the entire governmental structure of the State of Illinois, and particularly Cook County; and

Whereas, since the President's Commission has now been disbanded with submission of its report to the President of the United States, the only remedy for restoration of the good name of government in the State of Illinois and in Cook County and for the apprehension and punishment of the perpetrators of any criminal acts detailed in the "Blakey Report" is the immediate release of that material either directly by the President or through the Attorney General of the United States; therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the Seventy-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that:

1. The President of the United States be urged to release the "Blakey Report" to the Executive Committee of this Senate, to the Illinois Crime Investigation Commission, to the Attorney General of Illinois or to some other body with subpoena power, for appropriate action;

2. If the President should continue to suppress the "Blakey Report", he be urged to state explicitly whether he is following the policy recommended by his Commission which states, "Reports should be withheld from jurisdictions where corruption is apparent and knowledge by a corrupt official of the information in the report could compromise enforcement efforts", or, on the other hand, whether he continues to suppress the "Blakey Report" because of possible embarrassment to present officeholders; and

3. A copy of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, the minority leader of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives of the United States, all U.S. Senators and Representatives in Congress from Illinois, the Attorney General of Illinois, the Executive Director of the Illinois Crime Investigation Commission, the U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, the State's Attorney of Cook County, the President and President pro-tem of the Illinois Senate, the Speaker of the Illinois House of Representatives and the chairman of the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

Adopted by the Senate, March 4, 1968.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

"Guadalcanal Padre" Offering Prayers for Marines of Khesanh

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on March 5 I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a release of the Special Subcommittee on National Defense Posture of the House Armed Services Committee which contained the findings and conclusions of the subcommittee concerning the U.S. military posture in Southeast Asia. The subcommittee found, among other things, that—

Contrary to the views so often voiced by benighted disciples of defeat and appeasement, the battle in Vietnam is not between the greatest nation in the world and a small, underdeveloped country. Rather, it is a struggle with the United States on one side and Communist China and Russia on the other. It should be recognized and clearly understood that while the enemy we are fighting is the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong, they are merely the conduit for the aggression of China and Russia.

The Communist conduit in this case if, of course, Ho Chi Minh, trained in Moscow in the 1920's and the one primarily responsible for implementing Communist terror policies in this area.

It is indeed unfortunate that those who oppose U.S. participation in the defense of the South Vietnamese have chosen to ignore or explain away 50 years of Communist brutality and seek to place the burden of responsibility on the United States. Especially distressing is the fact that some protestors against the Vietnam war are clergymen who have twisted all moral concepts in condemning this Nation for its efforts. It is inexcusable that protests on moral grounds were curiously absent on the present scale by some of the present protestors who were around during the Hungarian slaughter in 1956 or the butchery in China after the Red takeover in 1949. Even worse, some of the Vietnam protestors would admit Red China to the United Nations, thereby ignoring the unbelievable devastation visited upon the Chinese people by the Chinese Communists. In charity, one should not impugn the sincerity of these people, but it is not unreasonable to question their objectivity and responsibility.

One illustration of the proper perspective on Vietnam was provided by the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 14 in an article entitled, "Guadalcanal Padre" Offering Prayers for Marines of Khe Sanh. Written by Carlo M. Sardella of the Inquirer staff, the account outlines the views of the famous Navy chaplain of World War II, Rev. Frederic P. Gehring. As a missionary in China Father Gehring learned firsthand about communism in Asia. He stated that—

There were 60,000 Communists in China then, and now there are 600 million. Communism, there and everywhere began to creep toward complete encirclement of the free world.

As in the case of the subcommittee mentioned above, Father Gehring places the Vietnam conflict in its proper con-

text and refuses to ignore the the 50-year record of unparalleled aggression inflicted by the Communist movement and its adherents of various nationalities. Not forgotten by him is the righteous use of force employed by the free world to obliterate the tyranny of the Axis Powers.

I believe that the padre of Guadalcanal represents the overwhelming majority of American clergymen who, with their congregations look to Heaven for divine assistance while anchoring their feet solidly and realistically on the ground.

I insert the above-mentioned article by Carlo M. Sardella from the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 14, 1968, in the RECORD at this point:

"GUADALCANAL PADRE" OFFERING PRAYERS FOR MARINES OF KHE SANH
(By Carlo M. Sardella)

The Rev. Frederic P. Gehring, the famous "Padre of Guadalcanal," who endured one of the most bitter sieges of the Second World War 26 years ago, will complete a novena of grace here on Thursday for the surrounded and outnumbered U.S. Marines at Khe Sanh.

In the Second World War Navy Chaplain Gehring landed on Guadalcanal with the famed First Marine Division. They faced a numerically superior Japanese enemy, and Lt. Gehring and his contemporaries prayed as they had never prayed before.

"We went on the offensive against the Japanese then—in August, 1942—after being on the defensive since Pearl Harbor," he recalled at the rectory of St. Vincent De Paul Church, 109 E. Price st. in Germantown, where he began his priestly career in 1930 and where he is now pastor.

VICTORY PREDICTED

"The Marines on Khe Sanh, all our forces and our people, will go on the offensive again," he predicted. "It's the Marines' way."

Father Gehring believes that the U.S. cause in Vietnam is the Nation's only hope against eventual complete encirclement of Communism.

The priest, who shared combat experience on Guadalcanal with former boxing champ Barney Ross, about whom he wrote a book, said the power of prayer must be combined with the determination of the people of America to see the Vietnam crisis through.

NOVENAS DAILY

His congregation has been joining him at daily Mass in a novena of grace to St. Francis of Xavier, the Basque Jesuit missionary to the Orient in the 1500s.

"We pray for our boys, and we pray that the whole world will come to its knees and pray," Father Gehring said. "I believe it was significant that Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said that Americans 'have to do a lot of praying.'"

Father Gehring was a lieutenant commander when he retired from active duty as a Navy chaplain. He has since been named national chaplain of the First Marine Division Association and the Catholic War Veterans.

CITES EXPERIENCE

Father Gehring's opinions about Vietnam are not those of a "hawk" with a military background, he said, but are based on his experience with Communism in Asia, dating back to 1933 when he became a Vincentian missionary in China.

"There were 60,000 Communists in China then, and now there are 600 million," he said. "Communism, there and everywhere began to creep toward complete encirclement of the free world."

The United States, he said, has committed itself against Communist expansion in Vietnam, and must honor that commitment.

PRAISES RUSK

"If we have to send another 100,000 troops to Vietnam to do the job, then we should send them," he declared. "I believe the sincerity of Dean Rusk in his testimony this week should rally America in these trying days."

There was sadness in the voice of the 65-year-old priest as he noted that young men in his own parish have been killed in Vietnam. "The tragedy of war comes home to the people, and it is sad."

It is noteworthy, he said, that many Vietnam veterans volunteer to go back. "They have learned what the stakes are, just as we learned it before them," he said.

Clear the Air

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as an original sponsor of H.R. 4287, a bill to provide a 20-percent tax credit to industries which install air and water pollution control facilities. I am happy to insert in the RECORD an editorial from Steel.

As the editorial points out, the need for air and water pollution control is great, but society should assess the cost of such a program and plan accordingly.

It is because of these problems—the urgent need and the great cost—that I feel that my approach and the approach of the more than 50 other Representatives and Senators who cosponsored this bill or introduced similar legislation, of granting tax credits, is the most efficient. Efficiency means here not only eliminating the need to wait for the availability of Federal funds for grants, but also eliminating the cost of the Federal bureaucracy in administering a program.

The editorial follows:

CLEAR THE AIR

(By Walter J. Campbell, editor)

We have just returned from the boat show. Our eyes were caught fleetingly by a gleaming 32-foot cruiser. It was a beauty. We felt a momentary longing for it, a longing that evaporated when we considered the cost.

It would have overtaken our total resources.

After all, we already are supporting a home, two cars, a golf club, and a daughter in college—not to mention some quite expensive federal, state, and local governments.

We don't feel underprivileged because we can't have everything. And we are glad we weighed the cost. We wish everyone would.

We particularly wish people dealing with public problems would ascertain the cost before launching huge programs.

A case in point: a newspaperman acquaintance has been assigned the task of doing a series on air and water pollution for his paper. He came to see us. He had a crusading ardor. He was vehement: "The steel industry has to do something about air and water pollution—even if it costs a million dollars."

His figures made us temporarily speechless.

Now, we bow to no man in our conviction that cleaner air and water has to be assigned a high priority as a national goal. We firmly believe this country must make vast expenditures to improve our environment and to resolve what has become one of our great public problems. But we ought to know the costs.

When we recovered from our surprise at our friend's lack of cost knowledge, we pulled out some figures we thought he ought to have: the steel industry today is spending more than \$60 million a year to control pollution. Since 1951, the industry has invested or earmarked \$652 million for pollution control. And the end is not yet in sight.

Yes, it's time to clear the air—not only of contaminants but also of hazy thinking and talking about costs. It's time to clear the air and get a more accurate appraisal of what we as a nation can spend without overtaxing our total resources.

WEOK Editorial

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, grassroots public opinion is one of the most significant indicators a Congressman has to help him determine the wishes of his constituents. There are a variety of ways he can gauge this public opinion—through correspondence, questionnaires, conversations with constituents.

One of the Hudson Valley's fine radio stations, WEOK has done me and all of its listeners a great public service. It has invited its listeners to indicate their feelings about the conduct of the Vietnam war by responding to a poll which it has undertaken. The station then intends to send along the results of the poll to Washington.

Mr. Speaker, if other stations throughout the country would follow WEOK's example, every public servant would have available this additional excellent source of information. Indeed, I think every Congressman should encourage stations in his district to do this.

I insert WEOK's special message to its listeners encouraging their participation in the poll in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an example of fine public service by a fine, responsible radio station:

WEOK is neither hawk nor dove . . . but we do believe that a healthy democracy requires the expression of the public's point of view. There is a war going on in a place most of us didn't know existed until our military forces arrived there. We know little or nothing of Viet Nam's people, culture, or politics. Many of us aren't even sure why we're fighting there.

WEOK feels that we are at a decision point in our prosecution of the war. Realistically, there are three options for us in Viet Nam. . . . each of which has responsible, articulate advocates both in public office and in private life. However, despite the protests, the demonstrators, the bumper stickers and the sign carriers, we believe that the great majority of the American people have not made their feelings known.

WEOK would like to start a mobilization of public opinion. . . . to let our Government know how we feel about our three options:

1) We can continue to pursue our present policy in Viet Nam.

2) We can escalate or step up our war effort and take whatever measures are necessary to bring the war to a successful conclusion.

3) We can decide that we're in the war by mistake, that we don't belong in Viet

Nam, and that we should make whatever moves are necessary to pull out of Viet Nam.

At this point, WEOK takes no stand on the merits of these positions. What we want to know is how you feel. Will you send us a post card outlining your position? You can simply write "Continue", "Escalate", or "Pull Out" on the card and send it to Opinion Poll, WEOK, Poughkeepsie. If you'd like to say more, please do. We'll send the results of this poll on to Washington. . . . your letters and postcards will speak for themselves. But this poll is only meaningful if YOU participate. We know we'll hear from those who are already agitating for one type of action or another. The person we want to hear from is the person who doesn't sign petitions. . . . who doesn't march in parades. . . . who doesn't join organizations. So think about Viet Nam. . . . and let us know who you feel by writing, "Continue", "Escalate", or "Pull Out" on a post card and sending it to Opinion Poll, WEOK, Poughkeepsie. Let's help our government make its decisions based on what we want.

Gen. David M. Shoup

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, almost 2 years ago, Gen. David M. Shoup, former Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, added his name to the list of distinguished American citizens critical of the U.S. role in Vietnam. General Shoup cannot be dismissed as a misguided idealist, or a military novice. For 40 years, he has fought for the principles of democracy. A combat veteran of World War II and a winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor, his views on the war in Vietnam deserve special attention.

In December 1967, my colleague and friend from New York, Representative WILLIAM FITTS RYAN, interviewed General Shoup about our military involvement in Southeast Asia. Under unanimous consent, I insert the transcript of this interview in the RECORD, as follows:

RECORDED INTERVIEW BETWEEN CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM F. RYAN AND GEN. DAVID M. SHOUP, RETIRED, FORMER COMMANDANT, U.S. MARINE CORPS

Congressman RYAN. This is Congressman William F. Ryan reporting from Washington. Our guest today is General David M. Shoup, retired, a combat veteran of World War II, winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor and former Commandant of the United States Marine Corps from 1960 to 1963.

The discussion today will focus on the question of the war in Vietnam. I think it terribly important that the American people hear from experienced military officers and understand that there is not among them a unanimity of view on the war which is currently taking progress in Southeast Asia.

General Shoup, our guest, was first commissioned in 1926; he served in China in various assignments during the 1930's, and during the Second World War in the South Pacific where he was decorated for his valor in leading the Marines on Tarawa. He was in command of all the forces ashore in that fighting through most of the time. Formerly

director of the Basic School at Quantico for Marines, during the Korean War he was Inspector General of the Marine Corps, and for five years served as Comptroller of the Marine Corps; in 1959 President Eisenhower nominated him as Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, a post in which he served with distinction until 1963 when he retired.

I am especially happy, General, that you can be with us here today, not only because of your distinguished service as the Commandant of the United States Marines and your distinguished combat service during World War II in the Pacific, but also because of the very lucid insights you have offered about our involvement in Southeast Asia.

In 1966 in May in Los Angeles in a speech which you gave, you made headlines.

Let me quote from General Shoup's speech at that time. He said, "I believe that if we had and would keep our dirty, bloody, dollar crooked fingers out of the business of these nations so full of depressed and exploited people, they will arrive at a solution of their own, which they will design and want, that they will fight and work for. And if, unfortunately, their revolution must be of the violent type, because the 'haves' refuse to share with the 'have nots' by any peaceful method, at least what they get will be their own, and not the American style which they don't want crammed down their throat by Americans."

General Shoup, that was nearly a year and a half ago, when we had not lost as many lives as we have today in Vietnam. Has your view changed any in the interim period?

General SHOUP. Mr. Congressman, first I want to thank you for the opportunity to be here. I feel quite honored to appear with you on this program and as far as my attitude with respect to that remark is concerned, I would like to say that I am pretty sure that more people today believe in what I said than they did a year and a half ago. A great deal of this has come from the information that gets back to us, particularly from South Vietnam; that the people there are not too happy about us encroaching upon their daily life, killing their women and children, devastating their country, and disrupting what for centuries has been their way of doing things. I think that my statement in May of 1966 is as true a statement as could ever be put on a piece of paper. I have not changed my mind whatsoever, and I can't help but think about how close we came in the early teen's, I guess, or 20's of doing this same thing to Mexico. But finally we let Mexico work out her destiny; and now she's a model really, still having trouble, but is a model in the business of becoming a nation.

Congressman RYAN. How did we get so deeply involved in Vietnam? Did we just slide from one thing into another? Was this sort of inadvertent, or does it fit into the context of the cold war and the two power struggle which has existed since the end of World War II between the United States and the Soviet Union?

General SHOUP. Well, I would like to go back just a little bit and state, so that there will be no mistake at all, and make it crystal clear, Mr. Ryan, that I am not against the Armed Forces. I'm not against what they're doing, if it's what they have to do to win, because they are subject to the orders of the United States Government; and I will have to say that in my opinion we have the best—the best integrated, best trained, Armed Forces team that we've had in the history of this nation.

But I think that as far as our national interests are concerned, which we are told are at stake, it is in this area that I disagree. I do not believe that what we are told are the reasons for being in Vietnam are valid

and proveable reasons. For example, I believe we are told that one of the reasons is to make it possible for the South Vietnamese to control their own destiny. Well, it's an interesting thought, when you think that most of the people we're fighting out there are South Vietnamese, with the exception of the regulars out of the North, and even some of those are South Vietnamese.

Congressman RYAN. Would you describe this basically as a civil war?

General SHOUP. I don't think there's any doubt about it, it's a bunch of people in South Vietnam that don't like those crooks in Saigon that they've dealt with for the last century or two, or in the history of their people, they don't want this; it's just exactly like Bolivia, Peru, and it can go on and on and on, the people are tired of these governments sitting back there and taking their blood down to where they just barely can live and struggle back to the rice fields. And the people that are fighting this are the very ones that we're fighting, when we support Saigon, and they are South Vietnamese.

Now the other item of "national interest" which I call a real, great boggy—and that is this business of having to stop Communism way out there. I think the airplanes from Kentucky flew 9,000 miles, 9,507 miles, so it's about 8,000 miles over the water. As I said before, I don't think we have a record of but two people walking on water and one of them failed.

They don't have enough ships in the next X years, or enough airplanes to get over here. I don't know what they're going to get here with. Well, somebody has finally conjured up that maybe the Chinese will get here.

And then we have the Domino Theory—well, I would say that we have pushed the biggest domino in Southeast Asia to the Communist side, and that's China itself. So we shouldn't make too much about the Domino business.

Congressman RYAN. I take it you don't buy the argument that the vital interests of the United States are at stake in Vietnam.

General SHOUP. I do not. I have never seen a timetable of what would be the detriment to our national interest if we had not done anything but send a bunch of advisors in there; of what would be the detriment to our country 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 years from now. I've never seen anything. I've never heard anybody try to explain it. And if they didn't study it that way, then they've been derelict in their duty. And the American people have never been told that would be our predicament. They just keep trying to keep the people worried about the Communists crawling up the banks of Pearl Harbor, or crawling at the Palisades, or crawling up the beaches in Los Angeles, which of course is a bunch of pure, unadulterated poppycock.

Congressman RYAN. There has been a great deal of talk—many Members of Congress and other leaders in our country have suggested that this is a war, which could be won and would be won militarily, if only the hands of the military were not tied and if only the advice of the Generals was taken. Have you any comments on this?

General SHOUP. Well, in the first place, I would like to say that I think it's a very happy thing, a very important thing, that we have the system we have where the civilians are in control of the military forces because I feel sure, if all the advice of all the Generals were taken, we'd really be in bad shape.

To answer your question more specifically, I suppose if the advice of the Generals is to have 2½ million people—2½ million troops or 3 million troops—over there, and they took that, well, I suppose we could whip that poor beleaguered little country down there of a race of almost dwarfs that are pretty good in the jungles. We might whip them

I suppose if they took the advice of the Generals.

Congressman RYAN. Do you think our inability so far to achieve a military victory lies in a failure of tactics on our part?

General SHOUP. No, I don't think it's a failure in tactics. I think it's a failure to conceive the real devotion of these people to their cause. We've grossly underestimated these people's attitudes and their determination that what they're fighting for is something that belongs to them; that they're right; and that they're going to fight to the death.

Now, it's a "good" thing when in 1964 Congress gave our Commander-in-Chief that blank check without much worry on their part or hearings or anything, there was only about 1 battalion of troops in South Vietnam at that time. How many battalions do you suppose are there now? I don't think you can count them on your fingers and thumbs. That's another thing.

Congressman RYAN. How many American forces are there now?

General SHOUP. Well, I read this morning (December 14) where, if they got all those airborne troops out of the air, along the first of the year there'd be 525,000 ten weeks or something ahead of time they had promised them. I would be a little reluctant to say that that was wrong, that there would be more, but I would like to see someone put it in writing sometime in the press that these figures include all of the naval people—the carriers, the destroyers, and the gunboats, the barges and the naval depots and so forth—that are being used down there. And include all the Air Force people and the Naval people that are in Thailand who are in there working to get these bombers out and get those patrol boats out.

I am getting so badly off in my mental thought about we're not being told the truth, that I just believe there are probably many more troops than 500,000 in South Vietnam if you include those people that are floating; and I think it's a good question. They don't say it that way. They just say troops in South Vietnam. Well, if that's a true statement, they haven't counted the ones on the water or the ones in Thailand, and they're American boys too.

Congressman RYAN. And they can legitimately be considered as in the theater of operations certainly.

General SHOUP. Well, they're shooting the shots at the shore all the time and the carriers are dispatching planes to bomb the North Vietnamese and the South. I would think they're part of the combatant forces. They're also subject to casualties from torpedo boats and artillery ashore.

Congressman RYAN. As far as the bombing of North Vietnam is concerned, I think it has been said that we have dropped more bomb tonnage on North Vietnam than we dropped in Europe during World War II or during the Korean War. From a military point of view, what is the value of this bombing? And have you any comment as to why it hasn't performed the miracles which it was held out to the American people of being capable of performing.

General SHOUP. Well, I don't believe that any sound military thinker intended to convey the thought that this would provide miracles; but I think the thought did lead the American people to believe that it was going to be far more effective, and more quickly, than it has been; and by that I mean an effect that you can see and that you can measure from day to day.

Well, my position on the bombing is this, number one: If the items that are going to South Vietnam are being disrupted, or destroyed, then the bombing must continue as long as our ground forces have to fight, because to take away any help from those boys that are fighting those battles out there on the ground I think would be ridiculous. Now I will have to say, and I don't know whether

this is a favorable statement, but with all of the bombing and close surveillance and what have you of the Ho Chi Minh Trail, over which many of the supplies are coming, I feel that we are now quite proper in referring to it as the Ho Chi Minh autobahn.

Congressman RYAN. In other words, the bombing hasn't really reduced the level of supplies coming over that "autobahn" as you call the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

General SHOUP. I just intended to convey the fact that the trail has improved so much that I think it could probably be referred to as an autobahn.

Congressman RYAN. What would be necessary, General, in your view, for the United States military to do in order to achieve a complete military victory in Southeast Asia?

General SHOUP. When one refers to a military victory, he is really saying in my opinion the defeat of the military of the armed forces of the enemy. And while we know we defeated the Japanese Armed Forces, and we got peace, we also know that there were still some Japs three or four years later that didn't know about it; and they were still fighting or ready to fight, when they were captured in some of the islands, including Guam. I don't believe that the complete destruction of the Armed Forces and that means the guerrillas and all the rest is a military possibility within the foreseeable future, unless we want to commit ourselves to genocidal actions, which of course we could do with the size of our country, barring intervention by China or Russia. We could commit genocide on that poor little country. I don't believe that we want to do it. And I believe that finally that would get a little bit beyond our ability to stand the immorality of it.

Congressman RYAN. General, you mentioned the possibility of intervention by China which brings me to another question. I had always assumed that leading military experts, Generals of the United States Army, including General MacArthur, had stated that, as a proposition of military doctrine, the United States should not become involved in a land war in Asia. Has that been your understanding of our military doctrine?

General SHOUP. I've only worn the uniform of the United States 41½ years, so "ever" is a long time; and in all my time, and when I acquired rank in which I was supposed to participate and understand some of these far-reaching developments, I have never known a military officer who would advocate, other than never, getting involved in a ground war in Southeast Asia. Further, during my time, I have personally heard three Presidents say the same thing.

Congressman RYAN. General Shoup, as former Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, I assume we're talking about General Eisenhower who became President Eisenhower?

General SHOUP. Right.

Congressman RYAN. President John F. Kennedy?

General SHOUP. Right.

Congressman RYAN. And President Lyndon B. Johnson?

General SHOUP. When he was Vice President.

Congressman RYAN. Have you any view as to how this war in Southeast Asia could be brought to a conclusion?

General SHOUP. Well, I don't think it's ever going to be brought to a conclusion by the surrender of the Armed Forces of South Vietnam that are our enemies, but I think it's going to be some kind of a negotiation which must take place, I believe, after a cease fire. And I believe that, if we would give Ho Chi Minh the opportunity to determine the time and the place to start negotiations and tell him at that time we guarantee we'd stop all bombing, all offensive action, of all kinds, and the use of all lethal weapons, and that we would cease fire on a

permanent basis at least as long as negotiations continued, I believe he'd have to accept it; if he didn't we'd certainly then know what I don't think we now know for sure, and that is the position of China actually in this business. And that, of course, is an important keystone to what we might look forward to in Southeast Asia.

Congressman RYAN. Let me see if I understand your proposal, General Shoup. Are you suggesting that, if the United States were to say to Ho Chi Minh and the leaders of North Vietnam that they could name the time and the place for negotiations, we would then, when negotiations open, cease all offensive actions.

General SHOUP. Yes, and that Ho Chi Minh would determine this time and place in consultation with the NLF to the degree that he felt necessary. In other words, the NLF would be subject to Ho Chi Minh's desires and not ours.

Congressman RYAN. In other words, if Ho Chi Minh said that he wanted the NLF at the bargaining table, then they should be there.

General SHOUP. Well, I would put it to the extent that he deemed necessary, or desirable perhaps is a better word—if he desired them. And I believe that, if he didn't accept such a thing, then—I am certain of this—that world opinion would then be on our side, which it isn't now. And world opinion and the American public opinion would be on the side with our Commander-in-Chief, which it is not now. And it is very desirable that we have such opinion behind our Commander-in-Chief and behind our country as a great nation.

Congressman RYAN. In any future negotiations, when they come about, if they come about, do you believe that the result would be some role in South Vietnam for the National Liberation Front, or the Viet Cong?

General SHOUP. I do not believe that you're ever going to stop the actions of the so-called revolutionaries who are in revolt against, what I refer to as the Saigon regimes—those people who have been strangling those poor people out there for centuries—for generations—until there is the possibility or the actuality of getting a government that these people will support. Until they support it because that government has demonstrated their helpfulness to them, that it has some value to them, you will never have a peace in South Vietnam.

Congressman RYAN. I believe very strongly that this, and I think you tend to agree, that this is one of the key elements which is necessary to realize if we're going to achieve a negotiation.

General SHOUP. True, Mr. Ryan, these people out there in the hills, against the Saigon people, against the Saigon people putting their people out to collect the taxes and so forth, those people weren't trying to be communist. They probably didn't even know what the word was or what it means, just like many Americans don't know. They didn't know. They're just trying to live a life; but the blood is being sucked from them for generations; and they're tired of it, so they revolt—not as communists necessarily—but as nationalists against the Government. They want to have a part. They want to be recognized and have a share in the land and in the fruits of their labors to a greater extent than they've been permitted.

Congressman RYAN. Isn't it ironic that the United States, which has always held out the ideal of freedom of people to have their own form of government, should be siding in this instance with the reactionary regime in Saigon?

General SHOUP. It's another one of the understandable things that's happened particularly since August 1964.

Congressman RYAN. General Shoup, the United States has never lost a war. There was a great deal of frustration over the Korean

war, but certainly we did not lose it. That frustration lead to a wave of reaction in this country during the early 1950's. I just wonder if you have an opinion as to what might be the domestic consequences of our failure to achieve a total military victory in Vietnam?

General SHOUP. Well, Mr. Ryan, I have been studying this matter of wars and deaths and so forth for quite a bit; and we talk about the great emphasis; how terrible it is and so forth, but Russia lost x millions in World War I and actually had 20 million people killed in the Second World War. How are they today? Getting along pretty good I guess. They're getting to the moon on time. They're getting out there in space on time.

Time is a great thing. Time heals a great many things. And I don't believe that we would need to worry one single bit about anything about how this murderous war got stopped. I don't believe our people would worry about it. I think they'd be just as they usually are—taking the tag off and saying discount after they've raised the price ahead of time. And as I think I told you before, they'd be busying themselves in trying to buy that piece of dirt where they were certain they wanted to make a roadway or another cloverleaf. They'd be back to their usual pursuits—which, by the way, is not thinking too strongly or too deeply about the matters of national interests and international interests.

Congressman RYAN. There's one other point I'd like to raise with you, General, because I know that you are very concerned about it. And that's the question of the youth of America. The question of protests that have taken place on some of the campuses, the disenchantment which is taking place in many of our young people. Do you think that this generation is any different really than other generations of Americans?

General SHOUP. Let me say that I think the youth of America are great. Now to show you what I mean, you can say the people of America are great, and a good many of them are in jails—committed crimes. The youth of America are great, but there's still a few that have done a few little things that we don't like.

I think that we overlook the fact that we've told semi-truths and lies to our young people for so long that they're finally revolting and want the truth. And they want it very much like their elders too in some areas. Elders say why don't they just once—and when they say "they" I guess they mean those gents back in Washington—that's usually what they refer to—why don't they just once try telling the truth first. These youngsters want the truth.

We start out with Santa Claus and Columbus on and on and on and on, and we pull the wool over their eyes and they are lied to in their history books. And since the Vietnam thing, they certainly don't forget the promise about letting the Asian boys fight it; they don't forget the promise about we're not going to escalate. They wonder what is this business of growing up in America? What are we going to inherit from our elders? Can we expect to continue this hogwash, this bunch of lies for our youngsters in the next generation? That's what they're worried about.

Congressman RYAN. Thank you very much General Shoup. I have been talking to General David M. Shoup, former Commandant of the United States Marine Corps about the war in Vietnam. It is encouraging that there are leaders such as General Shoup who recognize the consequences of our involvement and also understand the broad meaning of America and the opportunity which faces American youth. He has made a major proposal about bringing about negotiations in Vietnam, having suggested on this program that the President say to Ho Chi Minh: "You name the time and the place for negotiations

and I will be there, and we will cease firing as long as negotiations continue."

This is Congressman William F. Ryan reporting to you from Washington.

Congressman Gilbert Asks for Supplemental Appropriation for Antipoverty Program

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, as I have stated in this Chamber previously, Congress acted unwisely in failing to adequately fund the antipoverty program in the last session. Important and successful Headstart projects, Community Action programs, and training and employment programs have already felt the pinch of these untimely cutbacks.

I have introduced legislation with 34 other Members of the House to provide a \$200 million supplemental appropriation for the Office of Economic Opportunity. This appropriation will bring the funds for OEO for fiscal 1968 near the full authorization level. Last year we approved a supplemental appropriation of \$75 million for summer education, employment, recreation, and other antipoverty programs. It was not sufficient, but it was, nevertheless, a big help. We should take similar action at this time, but with a larger amount of funds.

In my district in the Bronx, N.Y., and throughout the Nation, plans are being made, or have already been formulated, for this summer's programs. Unless we vote the proposed supplemental appropriation, these important programs will not materialize.

Mr. Speaker, we must remove the crippling restrictions imposed by earlier cutbacks in funds.

According to the Office of Economic Opportunity, the estimated nationwide impact of these cuts are as follows:

Headstart will accommodate 13,000 fewer children in its all-year program this year than it did in the past year. The all-year total is about 200,000.

Legal services will provide 60,000 fewer cases.

The rural loan program will give assistance to 3,000 fewer families this year than had been originally planned.

The number of Job Corps trainees will be cut from 41,000 to 37,000. Four thousand trainees will be put on administrative leave with the privilege of reentry when space is available. The plan is to eventually cut the Corps to 32,000 through attrition.

Neighborhood Youth Corps will operate at a level of 400,000 members, a cut of 170,000.

Health services will continue to be offered at 41 centers, the current level; but nine centers scheduled for operation this year will not be opened.

Programs for the elderly, the rural poor, and family planning and housing will not be expanded.

The National Advisory Commission's report on civil disorders clearly identifies the need to strengthen our total anti-poverty effort. This is our opportunity in the Congress—and it is our duty—to act responsibly and heed the warnings of the Advisory Commission report.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues in the House to join me in supporting my resolution for a \$200 million supplemental appropriation to fund our fight against poverty.

Woodrow Wilson High School Athletic Success Story

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, being aware that many of my colleagues are ardent sports fans and knowing that all Members of this House enjoy a success story, I would like to take a few moments to tell of an athletic success story which occurred in my city of San Francisco.

Just last week Woodrow Wilson High School of San Francisco topped off an undefeated basketball season by winning the Tournament of Champions in Oakland, probably the most prestigious high school basketball tournament in California. Prior to winning the three tournament games and the championship, however, the Wilson boys had spun a skein of 25 consecutive victories and captured first place in the Academic Athletic Association.

These facts speak for themselves: Wilson High School's basketball team is pretty great. But there is much more to the story.

Wilson High School in San Francisco is one of the newer high schools in our area, having opened its doors only 5 years ago. It is also the smallest, having an enrollment of 1,750 students. The coach who has done such a tremendous job of building this championship team in 5 short years is Frank Ingersoll. Now Mr. Ingersoll obviously is an outstanding coach, but he has not been without his problems. Last year he suffered a heart ailment and was forced to turn the team over to his able assistant, Ed Rueda, who directed the team into the local association playoffs. At the same time, Mr. Ingersoll has been working on a master's degree at Stanford and will leave coaching next year to work in the field of health education. We congratulate him on going out a winner and on having a competent assistant, Mr. Rueda, whom we understand will be head coach next year.

Those of us who have participated in school athletics know that it takes much more than a good coach to make championship teams. Wilson High had much more. It would be perhaps unfair to mention one or two players by name and pass over the rest of the team, because as one of the sports writers for the San Francisco Chronicle said:

The hackneyed term "team effort" was never more relevant as applied to Wilson.

I would note as a matter of interest to basketball fans, however, that while Wilson had a key man who was 6 feet 9½ inches tall, the team also had a pair of guards who were 5 feet 9 inches and 5 feet 8 inches—proving that the tall boys still do not have it all sewed up in high school basketball.

But it was not only on the hardwood that Wilson students excelled. They also demonstrated superiority in the bleachers. A rooting section trophy was presented to the student body for its outstanding performance at the Tournament of Champions, which was attended by more than 600 Wilson students each night. If it is possible to identify any individuals for credit in building this healthy school spirit, it would be necessary to mention Miss Susan Greendorfer, the student activities adviser, and Mr. Art Montenegro, student body president.

Finally, I would like to mention to the Members of this House that Wilson High is an urban school in every sense of the word. Its boundaries include areas having the usual urban problems which have been of great concern to this House. As I read over the names of the basketball roster, I recognize surnames belonging to a variety of ethnic and cultural groups which enrich our city. I think there may be lessons to be learned at Wilson which would have a meaning far beyond the boundaries of this school.

Working together in a spirit of unity, these students have achieved something special and significant. They are enjoying the fruits of victory won in clean, tough competition which are best enjoyed by youth. I know that every Member of this House joins me in extending to their principal, Mr. Barton H. Knowles, and through him to every student of Woodrow Wilson High School, heartiest congratulations.

As a postscript, Mr. Speaker, I might mention that my alma mater, George Washington High School in San Francisco, where I played basketball a few years ago, finished in the cellar in city competition this year. But I would close by giving fair warning to Wilson, to watch out for us next year. We expect, in the words of a currently popular song, to be "Movin' On Up."

Relief From Jet Aircraft Noise an Urgent Need

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed encouraging that the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. STAGGERS] has directed the continuation of public hearings on H.R. 3400, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe aircraft noise abatement regulations. These hearings, to be resumed on March 19, 1968, before the Subcommittee on Transporta-

tion and Aeronautics, will provide opportunity for further attention to the problem of noise pollution, which is one of the major environmental problems facing our Nation today.

It was my privilege to appear before the subcommittee on December 6, 1967, to express my strong support for H.R. 3400 and my continued interest in legislation which would afford our cities some measure of relief from the noise which the jet age has brought.

Hawaii is the hub of Pacific international air travel. Along with the benefits which accompany such status, our citizens presently bear the extreme discomfort resulting from the noise of arriving and departing jets.

A graphic summary of the magnitude of this problem is found in a letter which I have received from Sister Kathryn Shannon of St. Anthony's Convent, Honolulu, Hawaii. I wish to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point Sister Kathryn Shannon's letter of January 18, 1968:

ST. ANTHONY'S CONVENT, MARY-KNOLL SISTERS,

Honolulu, Hawaii, January 18, 1968.

DEAR MR. MATSUNAGA: We were told that you are supporting a bill H.R. 3400 to control aircraft noise and are writing to encourage you in your efforts.

The disturbance here is almost constant—morning, noon and night—seven days a week. Eight hundred planes a day come in and more are expected. I have seldom slept a night through since being stationed here 3 years ago. During the day it is worse. The children are losing so much class time. We will appreciate any help you can give us.

Sincerely,

Sister KATHRYN SHANNON.

Mr. Speaker, it is a traditional function of democratic government to provide for the health, safety and welfare of its citizens, and I feel it is necessary that the Congress enact aircraft noise abatement legislation which would help to preserve the continued enjoyment of the natural environment and contribute toward an improvement in the quality of life for all Americans who live near busy jet airports.

I regard H.R. 3400 as a proper and necessary step the Federal Government ought to take, and I urge my colleagues to give this much-needed legislation immediate and favorable attention.

Shameful Sacrifice

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding editorials I have seen concerning the present course of the war in Vietnam appeared in the February 25 issue of the State newspaper, located in Columbia, S.C., which is in my congressional district. I commend this timely editorial to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

SHAMEFUL SACRIFICE

How many American boys must die in Southeast Asia before the United States decides to win the war?

How many ground troops must be fed into the Communist maw before the United States uses the full and awesome might of its military potential to achieve victory?

How long will U.S. policy be determined by a timorous concern over a mealy-mouthed but meaningless "world opinion" rather than by the best interests of this nation and the best means of halting Communist aggression.

Never in history has a nation at war imposed as many restrictions upon itself as has the United States in its bloody and seemingly interminable fight with Communist North Vietnam.

If anyone wishes to question use of the word "war," let him consider the dismal fact that almost twice as many American servicemen have given their lives in Southeast Asia than were slain on all of the battlefields of the American Revolution, the War of 1812, the War with Mexico, and the Spanish American War—all put together.

If the continuing sacrifice of the cream of young American manhood was bringing the war measurably closer to conclusion, the losses could be justified by the gains made for freedom in South Vietnam, in Asia, and in the entire world.

But if Americans (and South Vietnamese and their few other allies) are to lay down their lives while politicians and diplomats tip-toe through the haze of international relations and the maze of the United Nations, their deaths become as burnt offerings to foolish gods.

The price paid by the United States in the recent days of heavy fighting about Hue may be tragically eclipsed by even heavier losses if the North Vietnamese forces overrun the embattled and encircled Marines at Khe Sanh. We have no doubts about the fighting ability of the 5,000 Marines, but they face not only overwhelming odds in manpower but a startling array of firepower which has been assembled from material shipped into enemy hands from their Communist colleagues in Russia and Red China.

Perhaps the coming battle at Khe Sanh will bring home to the American people, if not to the Johnson administration, the supreme idiocy of trying to wage war in moderation.

Here are U.S. forces, surrounded by the regular forces of a determined enemy within a few miles of the enemy's homeland. Yet we are restrained from setting foot on enemy soil by way of counter-offensive or invasion. We launch aerial attacks against selected military targets in North Vietnam, yet we allow military goods to flow virtually unimpeded into the enemy's hands by sea and by land. We complain to neighboring Cambodia and Laos over the use of those nations as sanctuaries and supply routes, seemingly without result.

In short, we are waging half-war against a whole enemy. We strike and strive and bleed and die with one arm tied behind our back. The record being written by our fighting men on the scene is one of valor. Is it to be in vain?

The need is not so much for more fighting men in Vietnam as for more fighting spirit in Washington.

Speech of the Reverend Bernard R. McIlhenny

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 16, 1968, it was my privilege to participate in the 13th annual dinner dance of the Irish American Men's As-

sociation of Lackawanna County, Pa. President Maurice M. Cawley, Vice President James Cadden, Treasurer Patrick J. Tobin, Secretary Harold Donahue, and Financial Secretary Frank L. Laughney, together with their associates, cooperated in presenting one of the most outstanding programs in the long and distinguished history of the association. The Reverend Bernard R. McIlhenny, S.J., was principal speaker and delivered a most incisive address about the Irish character.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I insert his comments in the RECORD at this point in order that all Members of Congress might have an opportunity to enjoy this fine commentary:

Each year in the month of March a very special ritual takes place—there are parades and banquets, speeches and dances. History is recalled, tales are recounted and heroes are extolled. All is built around the feast day of the patron saint of an island—an island 150 miles wide and 275 miles long—an island which could comfortably fit within the confines of the state of Ohio—an island located at the cloudy crossroads of the Gulf stream and the Arctic winds—the Emerald Isle.

But it is not this wet and isolated island which brings us together each year—rather it is the inhabitants of that island known everywhere for their song and wit, for their politics and literary skills for their unique personality.

If I may, I would like to pause with you tonight and dwell a bit on this Irish character—it is elusive but it is unmistakable—many have written about it but writers only catch glimpses—no one captures the whole picture. Chesterton once described the Irish as romantics whose wars are merry but whose songs are sad. There is happiness but there is a wistful melancholy. There is religion but there is superstition. Their character is filled with as many opposites as their everchanging skies.

Where do you begin to describe the Irish Character? A first and foremost ingredient has to be a certain clanish togetherness. The family bonds are strong and loyalty is outstanding. Although the father is the head of the family, the mother has the influence of a queen within the family circle—The attachment of the Irish mother for her son is very special, whether she is slipping him some extra money or seeing to it that he gets the best piece of meat. The loyalty of an Irishman for his brother is legendary. A brother can talk against a brother but let no one outside the family do so. Yes, clannishness is a real part of their character.

Robert Briscoe, the Jewish Lord Mayor of Dublin, once wrote that the Irish are as puritanical as a passenger on the Mayflower—But puritanical as they are, they take quite a tolerant view of their proverbial weakness for drink—they see nothing deplorable in the fact that a town of 650 people in County Clare has 27 pubs. They are quick to point out the important social role which the pub plays in Irish life. Except on special occasions Irishmen seldom drink at home. A town will have several pubs to fit different tastes—some are noisy, filled with song and chatter—some are reserved and dignified. Another real purpose was pointed up by Barry Fitzgerald in the movie "The Quiet Man": "I think I'll go and join me comrades and talk a little treason"—the Irishman likes an audience when he drinks and talks—and that's the Irish pub—a stage for an orator—But it is an important part of the Irish character.

The Irish also love the art of conversation—a lost art in the era of television. They will fondle a word, rub it, polish it and only then arrange it in a sentence. But words alone do not make the personality—it is also the tone

of the voice. The Gaelic wit will shine through with retorts and deflating sarcasm. The story is told of McGrath, the auctioneer, who was trying to sell an iron cooking pot when he spotted the town's Protestant minister—"Now this nice round pot would make a lovely bell for your church"—"Yes, Mr. McGrath, with your tongue in it * * *." Or Dinny's observation to his friend at the race-track who was sporting a new pair of pigskin gloves bought with yesterday's winnings—"Isn't it curious, McCarthy, that when a man comes into wealth, suddenly his hands get cold."

Anyone who tries to capture the Irish character finds himself surrounded by baffling contradictions. With all their deep religious devotion, the Irish are a superstitious people who believe in ghosts and good luck charms. "I don't believe in the little people" an Irishman will tell you, "But they are there"—In spite of their ready wit and humor, they are quick to take offense. They are justly proud of the accomplishments of their countrymen but they are the first to agree with the words of Samuel Johnson "The Irish are a fair people, but they never speak well of one another." They are gentle but they are given to sudden moods of suspicion and anger.

Yes there are many phases to the Irish personality—which range from the bravery of their national heroes to the literary brilliance of such greats as James Joyce and George Bernard Shaw. Each one of us is proud to share just a tiny part of this personality—even if it only amounts to wearing a bit of green or recalling an Irish tale. But the real Irish Character still remains wrapped within the cloudy enchantment of that Emerald Isle—and no one of us will ever capture it—in the words of the song: "We might as well chase a moonbeam or light a penny candle from a star."

Finally tonight in the midst of our troubled world let each one of us pray for the inner peace and serenity which shine in an Irishman's eye and which are so much a part of his character. In the words of Cardinal Newman: "May the Lord support us all the day long * * till the shades lengthen and the evening comes * * and the busy world is hushed * * and the fever of life is over and our work is done * * then in his mercy may He give us a safe lodging and a holy rest * * and peace at the last."

Four Soldiers From State Are Killed in Viet Combat

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. Tony S. Oliver, Pfc. William A. Andrews, Pfc. Donald R. Titus, and Pfc. Norman A. Fossett, four young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend the bravery of these fine soldiers and to honor their memories by including the following article in the RECORD:

FOUR SOLDIERS FROM STATE ARE KILLED IN VIET COMBAT

The Defense Department reported yesterday that four more soldiers from Maryland have been killed in Vietnam.

The latest casualties were identified as:

Spec. 4 Tony S. Oliver, son of Moses Oliver, Jr., of 641 North Carey street, Baltimore.

Pfc. William A. Andrews, son of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur J. Andrews, of Benedict, Md.

Pfc. Donald R. Titus, son of Mr. and Mrs. John H. Titus, of Highland, Md.

Pfc. Norman A. Fossett, son of Archie F. Fossett, of 1233 Lafayette avenue, and Mrs. Beulah I. Fossett, of 1001 Springfield avenue, Baltimore.

MEDICAL AIDMAN

As a Seventh Day Adventist whose religion forbids combat duty, Private Titus, 21, was a medical aidman assigned to a rifle company with the 9th Infantry Division in the Mekong Delta. He was killed Friday in an ambush.

Private Titus once treated a South Vietnamese woman who had been shot by mistake, and an Army doctor told him that his first aid had saved her life, according to the soldier's father.

On another occasion, Private Titus treated a man the soldiers thought was a Viet Cong guerrilla.

Mr. Titus said his son was a 1965 graduate of Shenandoah Valley Academy and had attended Southern Missionary College, in Collegedale, Tenn., for a year. He quit college temporarily to serve in the military and was drafted in May, 1967.

Private Titus, 18, is survived by his parents; his sister, Sharon Ann Titus, of Highland, and his grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Elmer D. Snook, of Hendersonville, N.C.

Private Andrews, a helicopter crew chief, was killed Monday when his helicopter crashed en route back to base from a combat mission.

ENLISTED IN JULY

He was assigned to the 189th Assault Helicopter Squadron, stationed at Pleiku, and had been in Vietnam since late January. Members of his family said he had volunteered to be a flying crew member.

A June, 1967, graduate of La Plata High School, Private Andrews enlisted in the Army last July.

He is survived by his parents; two brothers, Sgt. Arthur J. Andrews, Jr., of Fort Meade and Charles B. Andrews, of New York; and a sister, Estell Andrews of Benedict.

Specialist Oliver, 19, who had been in Vietnam about two months, was shot March 2, according to his stepmother. She said he had enlisted when he was 17.

ATTENDED MORGAN STATE

Private Fossett, 22, had completed three years at Morgan State College when he was drafted in June, 1967, according to members of his family. He was a graduate of Bates High School, Annapolis.

An infantryman with the 9th Infantry Division, he left the United States for Vietnam last November 20.

According to the Defense Department, he was killed by gunfire during action March 3.

Survivors besides his parents are a half-sister, Deborah Brown, of Baltimore, and a grandmother, Mrs. Gertrude Jackson, of Glen Burnie.

Papadopoulos Addresses Students

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, Premier George Papadopoulos, of Greece, in a ceremony presenting scholarship awards to students at Athens University, addressed himself to present-day issues and philosophy in a most timely and pertinent fashion. Since this address by the Greek Premier did not receive any significant mention in world press circles I include as an extension of my remarks parts of the address as printed in the "Chicago Pnyx" a semi-monthly Hellenic publication:

PAPADOPOULOS ADDRESSES STUDENTS

"Please . . . the moment is so touching and so sacred that you need not reinforce this emotion by the expression of your support.

"Life is not an aim in itself. Life is a period of creative work. There is nothing in nature for the sake of living alone. Everything comes to life to create, and this should be our goal. . . . Today you are being trained by your wise teachers. . . . Their goal is that you become tomorrow's leaders of our society . . . a society . . . for an eternal and immortal Greece. . . .

" . . . at this stage in which you are struggling to mould yourselves as tomorrow's leaders of the society in which you live, is the uncertainty of the future. For God's sake, define your objectives as clearly as possible and define them with reality. Evaluate your real abilities, take stock of your own real possibilities and those offered by your environment in order to become part of the whole. Do not try to occupy more space than has been allotted to you by nature. You will face the complex of frustration. And the complex of frustration will lead you to deny what you live for and what you have come to fight for.

"Unfortunately, uncertainty has always been a weakness of youth which the enemies of the nation have exploited. The solution again does not lie in destruction; it lies in ourselves, in the revision of our objectives, in the relation of these objectives to reality; objectives which can only be achieved through an endeavour in the field, and the prevailing olympic spirit which was born in Greece and transplanted all over the world. So, for this reason, do not be filled with worry over the end of the race. The end will come in a natural way . . .

" . . . another sensitive weak point is the famous ego. Our ego is not the centre of the world. We were all born as a unit, which added to the remainder will form the social whole. The social whole constitutes the final target. We are a part of the social whole which is influenced and prospers within the social whole and unless the social whole moulds well it is not possible for us to exist and prosper.

"Rid yourselves of the moths of egotism and at the same time rid yourselves from human weakness by never accepting inner causes for your failures. Our environment should not be blamed for our misfortunes. We ourselves are to blame. Let us search ourselves for the causes of our failures. Let us cure and lift the obstacles and our weaknesses and let us proceed towards the road of creation. The environment is always friendly as long as we are friendly towards it; as long as we are willing to submerge our ego to the ego of the whole. This usually constitutes a point of weakness which leads people to anarchy.

" . . . Another point of weakness is to compromise with ourselves. It is not possible for a community of men to survive if those who form it do not respect the moral and social laws which govern relations between people. The respect of these laws by the people forming the community is the core, the linking point of societies. Deviations from this position tend to compromise ourselves. . . . beware the first steps of compromises towards which you will be driven by the weaknesses of society. We should never proceed towards a compromise. Never accept contradictions, nor the violation of moral and social laws. Rather, oblige ourselves to the environment which calls for us to respect the laws. . . .

" . . . Furthermore, protect yourselves from the unlimited greediness around you. This is another weakness of our times—the weakness of the human race. . . .

"Greediness, gentlemen, is a feeling or rather an instinct which dictates its will to things not human. Man, with power of the spirit and social education, always overcomes

this instinct and controls his greediness. You too, educated young men, the future of the nation, must check your greediness. Life is not the acquisition of worldly goods as a whole. Creation should be your aim. And Greece constitutes an example in world history of creation which it has attained without having at her disposal in the historic moments at various ages the biggest and most advanced goods to satisfy all kinds of needs of man.

"We have written with your fathers the epic story of Albania, using the pillaged weapons of the enemy which we modified to fit ammunition manufactured by the only war factory in Greece and we won the war. At that moment we did not have the perfect means offered by technology to face the invader. But we fought with whatever we had and we won history. We proved ourselves worthy descendants of our forefathers.

"Thus we see that there is no strength in all kinds of goods and means. Strength comes from faith in the creation for which we were born, from faith in what we should fight for. It is faith in preserving, in the history of humanity, the cradle, not only the cradle in which we first saw the light of day, but the cradle of the spirit and human values of world society. It is this sense of responsibility, this sense of mission that we Greeks should have. We should not be inclined toward greediness to acquire material goods. Let us always take stock of our possibilities and let us cover those needs which we can. And if whatever we do with faith, be sure that victory in any endeavor will always be ours. . . .

"Gentlemen, believe in the country you were born in. Believe in what is called Greece. Believe in the mission you have undertaken. . . . Do not look to escape abroad, do not turn your eyes to the darkness of curtains surrounding our community. . . . If Greece does not exist we do not exist either. . . . The Greeks are for Greece and Greece exists for the Greeks. Also, Greece should exist not only for the sake of Greece, but for human society as well. Believe in Greece. Fight for Greece. The greatest prize you could claim would be for you to appear to your descendants as genuine descendants of our forefathers. Respect yourself at all times, yourself not as a unit, but as a part of the entirety. . . . Be sure that you have placed yourself on the right path as regards your mission. Fight in the field instilled with the immortal olympic Greek spirit. Consider compromises as blasphemies. It is not possible to prosper as a society if we do not fight with olympic spirit. It is not possible to prosper as a social entity if we have ceased to be human beings and have crossed the boundary towards animal instincts. Only wild animals eat each other without a sense of responsibility in their endeavour to survive. By respecting ourselves we must impose respect to our environment. And if we succeed to earn self-respect be sure that we shall have succeeded to be the units required at this moment for the salvation of the fatherland. Finally, let us fight as Greeks for Greece. Our ancient ancestors have pierced darkness of the future in a distance of 3,000 years and piercing with their spirit the darkness of metaphysics they have proscribed the path of research and the road of struggle for human endeavour to expand the limits of the natural world.

"Do not forget that even in the most modern field of science today, the field of nuclear physics, the relevant centre established in our country bears the name Dimocritos. Think how many years ago this Greek had pierced the darkness of the future and had reached a position where he could specify and define the path of research which could lead man to expand the limits of the natural world, to reach what today is considered as omniscience.

"Ask yourself, is there anything in human endeavour, anywhere in human communities,

which could be compared as an achievement in this effort? And I emphasize this as a distinction of the sense of what we should do. We are a small nation both in population and size. But, with humility, we pride ourselves because there is the margin of the Greek spirit. And who is developing this margin? Who is struggling today bearing the flag of our country to pierce the darkness of metaphysics and lead metaphysical research as a guide in this research? In recent years the pace of evolution in the field of natural sciences, the pace of evolution in the field of progress is such that men have no time to become acquainted with new knowledge conquered in the field of science, in laboratories and schools.

"And in this endeavour to come into contact with the new, we have lost the road of Greece. The road of Greece is the road of the spirit and it is towards this road that we must preserve the first place in the relay race of the nation.

"You are the scientists of tomorrow. Keep in mind that the only objective in your endeavour today should be the effort of the nation. Material means are not necessary. Materialistic means of civilization should also be rejected.

"What we need is faith in internal Greece. We need belief in the immortal Greek spirit. We need belief in the great inheritance we have borne on our shoulders as descendants of our glorious forefathers.

"Greece should be rehabilitated to its scientific position as the torchbearer of human society. We must turn to the pages of history as the guide of the human spirit, in our case in the field of science and wisdom.

"We should make Greece an example of free law-abiding society of men living in harmony. Our mission is great. It is great because today we are faced with a situation we inherited for the immediate future which necessitates a great effort to turn vision into reality.

"Greece should become an area of Christian spirit. It should be a place in which fundamental principles of Christianity should prevail. 'Love thy neighbor as thyself and Love each other' should prevail.

"If we do not reach this stage of relations between men it would not be possible to be a society able to constitute traditionally the evolution of Greece. We should aim for a Greece comprising a society without poverty; offering protection to all members of our society. Our prosperity and our social welfare should extend security to any man living in Greece so that he should benefit from basic protection and care of his environment. This is something which it is necessary to achieve at any cost.

"Gentlemen, be careful, communism today is not projecting its theory, nor its prosperity. Neither it is projecting its society as an example to the free world. Communism is not rejecting itself because it is fully aware that today it would be impossible for a man of advanced perception and human education to believe in it.

"Communism projects weaknesses; stirs sensitive points of humanity and the feeling of injustice as compared to Justice. It stirs the feeling of uncertainty over the future; the feeling of indignation in face of the weaknesses of compromise of the environment in which the people live. And, alas, impassioning these people beyond the control of rational thinking they lead them as enemies of themselves and their environment to overthrow the regime, to open the way to tyranny. And, alas, most of the free men today are the victims of this communist method. They reaffirm the saying by Lenin according to which the bourgeois, in his own expression, the free men in our own expression, will give the rope and soap to be hanged by the communists. For God's sake, we Greeks whose heritage has nothing in common with the tyrants of communism, let

us safeguard ourselves from falling victims to the propaganda.

Speech by Hon. Daniel J. Flood

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the address of my good friend and colleague, the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, delivered on March 9, 1968, at the Baltic-American Committee's anniversary banquet held in my own city of Philadelphia. Congressman FLOOD was the principal speaker at this affair and the deserving recipient of this group's 50th Anniversary Award.

The address follows:

SELF-DETERMINATION: AN ENDURING DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLE

I am tremendously pleased by this honor you are bestowing upon me tonight.

To be given this 50th Anniversary Award for my services rendered to the Baltic peoples during my twenty years in Congress is without doubt one of the greatest compliments that has ever been paid to me during my long career as a Member of Congress.

I shall cherish this award, as much as I have always cherished the memory of being with all my Baltic friends—Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians, whatever the occasion.

This gala occasion, my friends, represents in many ways a contradiction to reality. Here we are gathered together in this magnificent setting, enjoying each other's company, eating the most sumptuous food, and drinking our favorite cocktails and other assorted beverages in a spirit of good fellowship.

This a joyful setting.

Yet there is a sense of unreality about it. I say this because the world about us is anything but joyful. We Americans are a people pressed on all sides: we are pressed in Asia, in Europe, in the Middle East, in Africa, and we are pressed in our own Hemispheric island. Pressures seem to be building up all around us, and there seems to be no diminution of these pressures in sight.

I suppose this is an inevitable condition: it is the price that we must pay as a people who are playing the role of a great power, indeed a super power. It is inevitable, because it is upon us that rests the major burden for the defense of freedom in the world.

How extraordinarily different is the role we play today and the power and authority we wield, how different it is from what it was 50 years ago when the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, won their freedom and established their independence!

For a few minutes this evening I should like to comment briefly on this difference. I should like to take a look into our historical past and contrast the America of Wilson's day and how it accepted the responsibilities thrust upon it, with the America of our own generation today. This brief excursion into history can be instructive, I believe, because it demonstrates very graphically the growth of the American people in assuming the responsibilities of world leadership.

Fifty years ago President Wilson, as the great evangel of world democracy, carried his message of self-determination of people to Paris and laid this vital democratic principle before Europe's leaders who were then about to construct a peace treaty with the defeated Central Powers.

It was this great and tragic figure Woodrow Wilson who more than any other person created within the souls of the oppressed in Europe and elsewhere in the world an awareness of freedom, not as an abstract principle, but rather as a goal that could be achieved by all people.

When Wilson came to Europe, he was greeted as a sort of "messiah of democracy." He gave hope to the oppressed, confidence to the forelorn, succor to the suffering.

But more than anything else, Wilson gave to the people of Europe, indeed to the people of the whole world, an expectation of a better future in a world that would be free of war and desolation. This was a grandiose vision that Wilson was projecting for mankind, but idealistic though it was, it still fired the imagination of the mass of humanity.

The Baltic peoples, inspired by this message of freedom and hope, were among the many Europeans who had in the course of time affirmed this natural right of self-determination and established independent national governments.

While in Paris negotiating with other world statesmen for a peace with the Central Powers, Wilson had achieved great success. To be sure, he had to make some compromises with the ideals he had set forth in his 14 Points. Reality had required this. But on the principle of self-determination that he asserted, there was no serious compromise. And that vital principle of self-determination of peoples, was to become the foundation stone of the political structure of postwar Europe. Millions of peoples, such as the Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians heretofore denied the right to determine their own destinies, were at last able to exercise a right that we Americans had enjoyed since the founding of our country.

This, my friends, was a great accomplishment, and to Woodrow Wilson must go a great deal of credit for universalizing this most basic of all democratic principles, the principle of self-determination of peoples.

But Wilson, upon returning to the United States, found that the American people were not prepared to assume the burden of world responsibility that he had thrust upon them by the Versailles Treaty and the Covenant of the League of Nations. They were not ready to assume a large and responsible role in the politics of the world. And accordingly they closed their minds to the pleading of their leader, and in the course of time withdrew within themselves and within the boundaries of their own country. In a word, Americans turned their backs on internationalism, preferring to enjoy the illusion of isolationism that had been their condition for over 100 years.

Thenceforth, we really played no major role on the world political scene. We were content to let Europe manage its own international affairs as if those affairs were of little or no concern to us. Indeed, Americans derived a sense of false comfort from the protection of the great Atlantic that divided them from troublesome Europe.

This abnegation of international politics, this withdrawal to the nation's inner self, had no serious effects during the first decade of peace following World War I. Europe was being restored, much quicker than at first realized. Serious problems faced European leaders, but they could be managed. The Baltic States had firmly established their governments and were progressing to a new and higher level of national fulfillment. They came to terms with their powerful neighbor, Soviet Russia, who obligingly recognized Baltic independence and pledged to respect the independence and territorial integrity of all three states.

So long as peace was not threatened, the absence of America from Europe and from the mechanism of peace contained within the League of Nations was not felt. Besides the United States did participate in some of

the social work of the League, and, as a participant in World War I, did engage in reparations discussions with the powers concerned.

But the picture changed radically in the 1930's. In the Far East, Japan moved out on its aggressive march, conquering first Manchuria and finally extending her power thrusts into South China, Southeast Asia, and the western Pacific. Hitler and Mussolini assumed power in their countries, harnessed the energies of their peoples in a new totalitarian form, and set out upon a revisionist course, a course that was to alter the international order that had been established at Versailles.

Still, the United States remained on the sidelines of world affairs, preferring its course of non-involvement. What is most striking about this behavior is that, as the threat in Europe increased, the United States responded by withdrawing progressively deeper and deeper into isolation. By 1937, when the Axis powers were far along the road to aggression and war, the United States had established virtually total isolation in the form of the Neutrality Act. The effect of this legislation, as President Roosevelt later said, was to deny the European democracies vital aid in military equipment that was needed to contest the claims of the dictators.

Thus, when our power was most needed to counter-balance the threat of Nazism and Fascism, it was not there.

There was no effective deterrent to Hitler.

France and Britain, having followed a course of appeasement, created a mood of permissiveness which enabled the German dictator to occupy the Rhineland, seize Austria, impose his will at Munich, and finally destroy Czechoslovakia.

Not until the invasion of Poland in September 1939 did the British and French resolve that this terrible force of evil must be stopped.

And what about the Baltic States in this environment of international anarchy? How did they manage to survive?

Well, as you all know, the states as independent political entities did not survive. The governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia hoped that a policy of neutralism would enable them to exist between the Teutonic and Slavic giants on their borders. This was an illusion.

For the fate of the Baltic States had been sealed on August 23, 1939, when Ribbentrop and Molotov concluded their now infamous nonaggression pact. The pact gave Hitler the green light to move into Eastern Europe. It also established spheres of influence in the Baltic and other areas to the East wherein the Nazis and Communists could impose their respective political wills.

The subsequent story is a familiar one: the Russians seized eastern Poland; within a few weeks thereafter, they imposed their pacts of so-called mutual assistance on the Baltic states which violated all sacred agreements negotiated heretofore; by mid-1940, the independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia was destroyed, and these nations were incorporated into the USSR.

Such was the thrust of events during those fateful 1930's and such was the disposition of the United States to remain on the sideline of history, uninvolved, to let Europe solve its own problems, to remain isolated from the world of reality.

We as a nation learned nearly too late, and to our peril, that our policy of isolation was in fact an indirect aid to the dictators. We also learned nearly too late, and to our peril, that this policy of isolation contributed in the long run to creating a threat of major proportions to our own national security.

But what a contrast between those days of Wilson and the disillusioning aftermath of World War I with the decades after the end of World War II! Unlike those days when

we Americans were tragically shortsighted, the American people have fully assumed the responsibilities thrust upon them to checkmate the expanding threat of Communism and to preserve the idea of freedom and self-determination of peoples. As a victorious power the United States did not as in 1920 turn its back on the League of Nations, but rather played a major role in establishing the United Nations organization and in seeking to create a new environment of peace and security in the world.

But, as we all know, the Soviet leaders and their allies, following in the steps of the defeated Axis dictators, have tried to destroy this fabric of peace; they have tried to establish a world system along political lines dictated by their own Communist doctrine. Unlike the 1920's and 1930's, however, the United States did not withdraw but rather has faced up to the challenge of the Communist powers: it has frustrated Communist purposes in Berlin, in Korea, in Cuba during the missile crisis, and now in Vietnam.

We as a people have learned a hard and bitter lesson from the illusions of the inter-war period: we know that a great nation cannot shirk its responsibilities to the world community. We know the tragic consequences of acquiescing in the conquests of an aggressor; we know that the problems of today, however overpowering they may seem, are only made more difficult by letting them ride and by avoiding the responsibility of facing up to their reality.

This was our lesson of the inter-war period. We learned it, nearly at our peril, but the important fact is that we Americans learned it, and learned it well. We are steered by experience against any recurrence of such folly!

How Wilson would judge the character and thrust of American foreign policy today, can only be a matter of conjecture.

But of two things we can be sure.

He would certainly find satisfaction in our commitment to the United Nations which is after all the fulfillment of his initial idea of the League.

And, moreover, Wilson would certainly find satisfaction in our unchanging belief in and attachment to the democratic principle that he made so universally revered, and that is, the principle of self-determination.

For this is really what the whole Cold War is about. It is about the right of peoples to determine for themselves what form of government they wish to devise for their own national destiny. This is the essence of the American position with regard to Soviet threats in Germany; it is the essence of our defense of South Korea; it is the essence of our position in East Europe; it is the essence of our position in Vietnam. And it is this same principle of self-determination that we hold up as an ultimate goal to be achieved by the Baltic peoples now subject to Communist domination.

We dare not dilute this powerful democratic principle of self-determination; we dare not set it aside as a motivating force in our foreign policy; for it is this principle that has made us the moral leader of the world; it is this principle that inspired hope in the oppressed; it is this principle that provides the inner dynamism and the outward thrust of American policy; it is this principle that is the hope of all peoples, such as the Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians, who languish in their unnatural state of Communist servitude.

Yes, my friends, Wilsonianism is relevant today; it is still the guide of life for peoples who wish to achieve progress and fulfillment in democracy; it is still the guiding principle of America, but more important, not an America uninvolved, uncommitted, an America isolated, but rather, an America determined to be a directing force, a leader, an inspiration to all who seek freedom of the human spirit.

St. Patrick's Day

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, March 17, the Irish and their descendants the world over gathered to pay tribute to Ireland's patron saint, St. Patrick. I have always been happy to participate in Newark's St. Patrick's Day celebration, for it is a joyous and inspiring occasion. This year a severe rainstorm forced postponement of Newark's St. Patrick's Day Parade, but I nevertheless had the pleasure of meeting with many fine friends of Irish heritage and officials of our celebration: Bernard J. McCreesh, the grand marshal; Paul Reilly, our deputy mayor; Mrs. Joan White Corcoran, the deputy grand marshal; and Patrick J. Yorke, parade chairman.

Over 1,500 years ago St. Patrick succeeded in converting Ireland to the Christian faith, founding some 365 churches, personally baptizing some 12,000 persons, ordaining a large number of priests, and establishing numerous monasteries and convents.

It is without doubt inspiring to recall the remarkable life of St. Patrick. At the age of 16 he was seized by marauders and sold as a slave, but after 6 years of captivity he escaped to France and studied at the monastery of Levens. It was here that he received his call for missionary service in Ireland. According to legend, he heard Irish voices saying:

We pray thee, holy youth, to come and walk again amongst us as before.

St. Patrick heeded this call, and in a time of chaos and fear, when ancient institutions were crashing down, he presented to Ireland the supreme gift of faith and freedom.

St. Patrick has gained a noteworthy place in the life of our country. Indeed, in earliest American history homage was paid to this great saint. The first recorded celebration of St. Patrick's Day in the United States took place on March 17, 1737, in Boston. Twenty-six men celebrated in honor of this day and founded the first Irish organization in America—the Charitable Irish Society. The first recorded St. Patrick's Day Parade took place in New York as early as 1766. George Washington's troops paid tribute to St. Patrick in 1778 at Valley Forge, and in fact in 1781 George Washington himself was made "an Irishman—as far as it was within the power of the Irish to do so" by being installed as an honorary member of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in Philadelphia.

St. Patrick's Day has assumed a relevance and importance in this Nation not only for Americans of Irish descent, but for all Americans of all national origins. This is not difficult to understand, for St. Patrick's Day is a day of tribute to man's faith, determination, strength, and, perhaps above all, his spiritual essence.

It is, therefore, an honor for me to join

in commemorating on this day a man who is an international symbol of the power of religion and freedom. On this day we can all feel the pride and joy it is to be of Irish heritage, from the country William Butler Yeats called—

"Land of heart's desire,
Where beauty has no ebb, decay no flood,
But joy is wisdom, Time an endless song."

George Meany Speaks on Civil Disorder Report

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 5, George Meany issued a statement on the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. I feel Mr. Meany's active support should be noted by my colleagues and, therefore, insert this statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

The report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders fully justifies President Johnson's confidence that a group of thoughtful American leaders, drawn from a broad spectrum of American society, could and would evolve a program to meet the most critical domestic crisis the nation has faced since 1932.

The President, as well as the commission, deserves great credit for the result.

The report itself is of inestimable value. It is a compilation of some measures already in being, though on a small scale; of other measures now before the Congress, and of additional proposals which, go farther.

Much of what the commission recommends is an extension of the domestic program of the Johnson Administration. In supporting that program the AFL-CIO, too, has often urged such an extension. While there may be room for debate over specific implementation of the report's proposals, its general thrust—and its sense of urgency—reflect the long-held views of the labor movement.

Predictably, the report has been attacked by some editorial writers and by Congressional conservatives on the grounds that its proposals involve an "impossible" expenditure—an expenditure the nation cannot afford in view of the costs of the war in Viet Nam.

We reject that argument with respect to the report, just as we have rejected it with respect to earlier domestic programs.

Of course, meeting the crisis in our cities will cost much. But the struggle in Viet Nam is an added reason why this outlay must be made, not as an excuse for ignoring the problem. Americans are fighting in Viet Nam for the right of self-determination—for the basic principle of free, democratic choice. The perpetuation of conditions which effectively deny full participation in American society by millions of citizens is a betrayal of that principle, and an affront to those who are giving their lives for it.

A degree of sacrifice may be necessary to carry on this two-front war. The AFL-CIO has repeatedly expressed its readiness to pay its fair share of such costs. We are confident that if the issue is squarely faced and clearly offered, the American people will respond to the challenge, as they have on every occasion in the past. They will respond; for in fact—as the commission's report so eloquently demonstrates—there is no other choice.

Does Civil Disorder Have a Dollar Sign?

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the report of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders suggests that riots were due to economic disparity. It seeks to place the blame for the rioting which included arson, burglary, robbery, looting, vandalism and murder, on many segments of American society whose activity had been expressly directed toward preventing civil disorder. The Commission included criticism of Government for programs insufficiently implemented, police for being too tough in arrests, judges for trying to be firm, and the white community generally for being "racist."

What the Commission did may be likened to blaming the warden of a well-run penitentiary for the crimes of escaped convicts, or parents for having conceived children who have become dropouts from society.

In the issue of Roll Call of March 14 appears an article by Allan Brownfeld which discusses the report of the Commission at some length and I think constructively. Inasmuch as what to do about the possible recurrence of civil disorder this summer is very much on the minds of those having the responsibility for maintenance of law and order in urban areas, I commend the thoughtful reading of Mr. Brownfeld's remarks and suggest that it might not be inappropriate to appoint a commission to review the report of the Commission on Civil Disorders in an effort to come up with something other than a prescription for massive Federal handouts as an answer to violence in the streets.

As Mr. Brownfeld says:

If we don't understand the situation as it is we will never correct it.

It appears to me that there is a very real question of whether the Commission on Civil Disorders really understands the situation as it is. The impression is implicit in its words that the Commission has in fact sought to establish itself as an advocate for minority groups rather than a responsible catalyst.

The article follows:

[From Roll Call (the newspaper of Capitol Hill), Mar. 14, 1968]

THE NONREPORT: RIOTS COMMISSION NEGLECTS SEEKING CAUSE OF VIOLENCE

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

The important question which was barely mentioned in the Riot Commission Report was this: Are crime, riots, and violence motivated primarily by economic factors, or are there other contributing factors which may be even more crucial? The Report should have sought to carefully answer this question. Instead, it concluded with a program based upon a questionable assumption. Yet, there is no guarantee that the multi-billion dollar program involving jobs, housing, and education will in any way prevent future riots. These programs may be worthwhile on their own merits, but do they really have anything to do with the growing lawlessness in our cities?

According to the Commission, riots were caused by everyone but those who had, in fact, perpetrated them. The blame was spread

over a wide range. Government was to blame, for its programs had not effectively reached the people. Judges and police were to blame, for they were often to harsh and disrespectful. The press was to blame, for it exhibited lack of understanding. The real cause of the riots, according to the Commission, was "white racism."

The Commission stated that "our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white, separate and unequal." This was even too much for Vice President Humphrey. He noted that the Commission did not take adequate account of the rising repudiation of racism throughout the white community over the last 20 years. It ignored, he said, "a solid platform of laws, programs, and experience on which to build."

The approach taken by the Commission was characterized this way by columnist Joseph Kraft: "It is based on the notion—the Marxian notion—that economic deprivation is the root of social unrest. It thus prescribes elaborate programs to improve economic opportunity through welfare payments, public housing, and educational subsidies . . . The result of that approach, alas, has been what might be called reservations—the herding of Negroes into core cities, guarded by the police, and the monthly handouts of whiskey and blankets in the form of federal programs."

Kraft notes that the Commission takes into account the noneconomic causes of the riots, and that the Commission itself shows that the rioters did not emerge from a background of hopeless poverty. Still, its recommendations are all based on the fallacious economic theory.

It makes another serious error. It advocates programs which tend to reward violence. William White points out that "The Commission, headed by the Democratic Governor of Illinois, Otto Kerner, and the liberal Republican Mayor of New York, John Lindsay, has in substance issued an invitation to deprived or simply angry people to seek their remedy in yet more violence . . . It promotes what it most honestly seeks to avoid . . . the Commission's indictment of 'white racism' takes practically no account of the demonstrable rise of an even more bloody minded 'black racism.'"

The economic theory has been shown to be completely invalid. Irving J. Rusin, head of the University of Michigan Center for Urban Studies, made a survey of those who had been arrested for rioting in Detroit. He states that "solutions based primarily on improving schools, housing and employment for urban Negroes are not responsive to the deeper needs behind the violence. They are the comfortable solutions, things that our society knows how to do best . . . but they are not what the riots are all about."

In the main riot areas of Detroit, according to the University of Michigan survey, the median annual income of Negro households is \$6200. This is only slightly lower than the figure for all Negro households in Detroit, \$6400, and not far below the median white household income of \$6800.

Educational attainment of Negro household heads—forty five per cent were high school graduates or better—is higher in the riot area than throughout the city.

Seventy per cent of Negro households in the riot area have automobiles available, and "Negros living within the riot area are substantially better off in every respect than Negroes who live inside the deep core. They are also somewhat better off than the whites who live in the riot neighborhoods."

Of those arrested, Detroit Police Department arrest records show that only ten per cent of the Negroes were juveniles; 18 per cent were between 17 and 19 years old, 24 per cent between 20 and 24, 17 per cent between 25 and 29, and 31 per cent over 30.

The Urban Law Center's survey of 1200 non-juvenile male arrestees shows that 83 per cent were employed, 40 per cent of them

by the three major automobile companies and an equal percentage by other large employers. No income data was gathered, but annual wages of \$6,000 and more can be assumed. The conclusion of Professor Rubin: "If we deal only with housing, education, and jobs, we are sowing the seeds of even greater trouble."

Those who are searching for the causes of our major riots have not considered the fact that such riots may be the ghetto manifestation of the general breakdown of respect for law so rampant in our society as a whole.

In his recent volume, *The Lawbreakers*, Indianapolis News editor M. Stanton Bevans points out that there was much less crime in America during the depression. In 1933, total reported crimes against the person stood at about 150 per 100,000 of population. This figure dropped steadily throughout the continuing years of the depression and the enforced scarcity of World War II. As the war came to an end and prosperity returned, the line turned sharply upward and has continued to climb ever since. By 1965, the figure stood at more than 180.

It is not economic deprivation which has caused the increase in crime, for as income has risen, so have crime statistics. It may be what is called the "new morality," the idea that men may obey the laws with which they agree, and disobey others, the idea that government may be coerced through the use of blackmail, that each individual has the right to immediate gratification of his desires, whatever the consequences to others.

Those who, over a long period of time, have established the philosophy of relativism may be largely responsible for the consequences. But this is not new. In his novel, *The Brothers Karamazov*, Fyodor Dostoevsky spells out an appropriate parable. Among the book's many characters are the fiery intellectual, Ivan, and his dim-witted half-brother, Smerdyakov. Ivan preaches that there is no God, no truth, no right and wrong, and that everything is relative. Being an intellectual, he doesn't do anything about these ideas; he simply preaches them. Smerdyakov, however, is not an intellectual. He listens to Ivan's preachments, accepts them, and acts on them. He murders their father.

When the horrified Ivan confronts him, Smerdyakov explains: "I was only your instrument, your faithful servant . . . You said, 'Everything was lawful' . . . For if there's no everlasting God, there's no such thing as virtue." So, why not kill?

Society seems surprised that as a result of the annihilation of values and standards people have now started to act as if standards and values do not exist. When our highest authorities say that everything is relative, we should expect the increase in crime and violence which we have seen.

Many still insist, as the Riot Commission did, that poverty creates crime, and that if you spend enough money to combat poverty, you will end violence. But in America today, it is suburban crime which shows the sharpest rate of increase. The F.B.I. states that suburban crime is up 17 per cent and "Young people comprised 54 per cent of the total arrests for the serious crimes in the suburban communities." Would more affluence have solved the problem?

Professor Ernest van den Haag concludes that "the countries with the lowest living standards usually have very low suicide and homicide rates." Great Britain and Sweden have more advanced welfare than our own. The result: crime is increasing at an even more rapid pace.

It may be good to pursue job programs, and housing programs, and programs for improved education. The Riot Commission has not, however, in any sense shown that these are connected with the riots. And if we don't understand the situation as it is, we will never correct it.

Stephen A. Koczak and the State Department

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Jackis, Nes, Norpel, Hite and Burkhardt, Otepka and Koczak.

Mr. Speaker, these are but a few of the names I have called to the attention of Members of this body over the last few years and especially the last dozen months. They are names of men who have been maliciously and knowingly harassed because they chose to put their Nation first and such items as "institutional loyalty" second. Thus, they incurred the calculated vengeance of the system which rewards the sheep, the weak, who can be manipulated.

Although each case varies, they are similar in that each of them was the subject of nearly incredible internal policies or decisions. Policies designed for the circumvention, perversion, or destruction of fair and just personnel procedures, policy formulation, economy, security, and the Nation's best interest.

Of special interest is the case of Stephen Koczak. Koczak's case is unique since he is the first "selected out" Foreign Service Officer to attempt to gain reinstatement and vindication. And his fight against the system is all the more difficult because of the lack of appeal within the Foreign Service. In an attempt to fill this void in the rights of Government employees I will introduce, within the next week, legislation placing an appeals process within the rights of Foreign Service employees.

The right to appeal an adverse action is, however, only one facet of the Koczak case. A highly readable and well researched account of the case as a whole is contained in the latest issue of Edward Hunter's monthly publication, "Tactics." In my opinion this is the finest treatment of the Koczak case available, and a successful attempt to include the details without losing sight of the significance and context into which they should be placed.

The author will be remembered not only for many years as a journalist, but for his pioneering work in the area of psychological warfare and for coining the word "brainwashing." Before submitting his article on the Koczak case for the *RECORD*, I also include a summary of Mr. Hunter's life and career as it appears in "Who's Who in America." These items follow:

BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL DATA OF MR. EDWARD HUNTER

Hunter, Edward, foreign correspondent, author; born in New York City, July 2, 1902; son of Edward and Rose (Weiss) Hunter; self educated; married to Tatiana Pestrikoff, June 30, 1932 (divorced May 1961); children—Robert and Tate Ann. Reporter and news editor of various newspapers, including Newark Ledger, New Orleans Item, New York Post, New York American; reporter Paris edition of the Chicago Tribune, 1924-25;

news editor Japan Advertiser, Toyko, 1927; editor Hankow (China) Herald, 1928-29; Peking Leader, 1929-30; covered Japanese conquest of Manchuria, Spanish Civil War, Italian conquest of Ethiopia, International News Service, 1931-36; pioneered in revealing brainwashing, introducing it to written word. Chairman Anti-Communist Liaison, 1962—. Consultant in psychological warfare to the United States Air Force, 1953-54. Served as propaganda warfare specialist, Army of the United States, with morale operation section, Office of Strategic Services, Asia, World War II. Author: *Brain-Washing in Red China*, 1951; *Brainwashing: The Story of Men Who Defied It*, 1956; *The Story of Mary Liu*, 1957; *The Black Book on Red China*, 1958; *The Past Present: A Year in Afghanistan*, 1959; *In Many Voices: Our Fabulous Foreign-Language Press*, 1960; *Attack by Mail*, 1963. Contributed articles on psychological warfare, politics and extremism to numerous magazines. Clubs: Overseas Press, Silurians. Address: 320 N. George Mason Dr., Arlington 3, Va.

STEPHEN A. KOZAK AND STATE DEPARTMENT: ECHO OF SCANDAL AT WARSAW

Stephen A. Koczak in mid-April of 1966 attended a hearing by the ad hoc subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on a bill that quietly was being railroaded through. The measure would have deprived all State Department personnel, whether directly employed or indirectly as members of the U.S.I.A. and A.I.D., of their civil service status. It would have put them directly under foreign service regulations, which permit the State Department to assign anyone to any kind of work or make-work, regardless of capacity or rank, and even to fire him without appeal.

Testimony was ending for the day when Sen. Claiborne Pell, who himself has a State Department foreign service record, interrupted to exclaim:

"I would like to go on record at this time that, in going over the witness list, I am surprised that no foreign service officers have chosen to come up and speak . . . I have heard all kinds of grumblings about this bill, received private letters and I am really surprised at the lack of gumption that is shown by this fact. If they are against it, as they say they are, why don't they come up and say so, but not grumble, and it actually takes no courage if they are retired."

Sen. Bourke B. Hickenlooper remarked, "If I might inject, I may say that I know of a few foreign service officers who say it would be their neck if they come up here and dared to testify against what was announced and ordered policy of the top office."

UNION LEADER POINTS TO A SPECTATOR

Whereupon, Bernard Weisman, president of the American Federation of Government Employees, Lodge 1812, U.S.I.A., stood up and declared there was present a foreign service officer in the hearing room, who had told him he would be most happy to testify. Weisman, who already had testified, pointed to Koczak, seated among the spectators. Koczak's name was placed on the witness list, and some days later, he was given the opportunity to testify against the bill. What had been arranged as a smooth operation was thrown off the rail, and the train never did get back on the tracks. The bill was pigeonholed, as it deserved.

This was the first public appearance of the man in what now is known as the Koczak case.

Actually, the case began when Koczak, a Harvard honors graduate who went into the Army in 1942, and then directly into the foreign service in 1946, arrived in Berlin in September, 1960. He had been assigned to the U.S. Mission there as chief political officer, to focus on the Soviet occupied zone.

He had been chosen for three reasons. First, he had been the intelligence research officer on East Germany at the State Department.

Second, he had predicted Israel's Sinai's campaign of 1956 two months ahead, while in Tel Aviv as political officer. Third, he had been expelled from Hungary, where he was serving as political officer in our legation, because the Hungarian Stalinist government in January of 1949 considered he knew too much about Soviet affairs. Koczak's assets in the State Department were regarded as not merely that of an astute desk man, but this most rare type, the analyst who goes out in the manner of a reporter and gathers firsthand and other otherwise unobtainable data.

FOURTEEN UNOBSTRUCTED, DRAMATIC YEARS

Historic events had made Koczak's preceding 14 years dramatic, and had given him the opportunity to rise more rapidly in the State Department elite than normally. Two things happened, though, that were to have a decisive impact upon him. One was the election of John F. Kennedy to the Presidency. The other was the Warsaw sex and spy scandal.

Thomas A. Donovan, political officer at our embassy in Poland, was transferred precipitously to Berlin just ahead of Koczak, where he became chief of the Eastern Affairs division in the U.S. Mission, a post intended for Koczak. Donovan was rushed out of Poland because of his involvement in the scandal.

The next few months after Koczak reached Berlin were historically momentous. A radical transformation had been begun inside our government, with furious shifting and replacement of personnel to conform to the substitution of a policy of detente with the Soviet Union for a policy of containment. Detente required appeasement. The change came as a thunderbolt to Berlin, for Nikita Khrushchev already had started his power play for the control of the entire city.

Donovan, in his late thirties, had been a most popular figure in Warsaw, especially among the avant garde, movie and theater groups. The starlets loved him. He was political officer, but the extraordinarily successful penetration of the U.S. embassy by the communists showed that this glamorizing had so dazed him that he failed to relate it to the well-established red tactics of intrigue and espionage.

He could not rid his mind of this adulation. He was too identified with the art colony and the jazz set in Warsaw, and in addition, was a favorite at the Polish foreign ministry. He soon began crossing from the Western sector to the Soviet sector of Berlin to telephone his Warsaw friends. Western Allied monitoring intercepts of phone calls from West Berlin to iron curtain countries were routine, of course. Donovan knew how rigorously this check was maintained, for copies of the intercepts frequently came over his desk. We could do no such monitoring, obviously, of calls made from East Berlin.

A trip from the U.S. mission in West Berlin to a telephone booth in the post office in East Berlin, from which long distance calls had to be made, was at least half an hour each way. Of course, such calls constituted a security matter of the highest importance, surely in view of the numerous transfers that were being made of compromised American personnel in Warsaw, and the known infiltration of our mission in Poland by Polish and Soviet agents. But Donovan even made an unauthorized trip to Warsaw.

OBVIOUSLY, SECURITY SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THIS

This confronted Koczak with a distasteful dilemma. He did the least that responsibility required under such unpleasant circumstances, by verbally reporting it to Howard Trivers, deputy chief of the mission. Later, Koczak learned that this information had not passed beyond Trivers. Instead, there was a new development. Poles, singly and in

groups, from government people to fashion models, and cultural and theatrical ensembles, began contacting and visiting Donovan in West Berlin. The meetings took place outside the office.

Koczak was ex-officio a member of the Berlin intelligence community, and as such he had the responsibility of checking up at least with C.I.A. and other senior intelligence people we have in Berlin. All of them told Koczak that Donovan was not filing any reports for them, and he was not making any reports on these contacts to the State Department, either.

Koczak consulted the American chairman of the combined intelligence board, an Army man, who declared: "I send out GIs to gather combat intelligence, and they sometimes are killed in line of duty. What kind of foreign service does the State Department have if you do not dare to report such a matter because you are afraid for your career? You have no choice."

Koczak thereupon went to E. Allen Lightner, Jr., U.S. mission chief, who told him this was the first he knew about any of this.

THE TONE OF CIA AND STATE DEPARTMENT REPORTS UNDERGOES A CHANGE

By now, Kennedy had had his Bay of Pigs fiasco, and had been confronted by Khrushchev in Vienna. Kennedy became alarmed, and Khrushchev felt that he now had a man whom he could browbeat. The German desks of the State Department and CIA in Washington and in Europe were apprehensive that West Berlin was to be bargained away, or that we would tolerate a rapid Soviet erosion of our rights in West Germany. The approach now taken in reports underwent change.

The President's irritation with CIA had become obvious, and so its representatives modified their reports in a manner to appeal to his subjective judgment, rather than concentrate on the events themselves. A similar subtle transformation took place both in State Department reports in the field and in evaluations made back home. Donovan began claiming a discernable mellowing of Soviet Russian and East German attitudes. Koczak, on the other hand, insisted that the crisis actually was growing.

As an example, he pointed out that Moscow and East Berlin were likely to seal off the East from West Germany. On Aug. 12, 1961 he told a surprised Daniel Schorr of CBS: "I wouldn't be surprised if the Soviets built a wall tomorrow." Schorr strengthened his broadcast accordingly, and on Aug. 20 when he returned with the then Vice President Johnson, he told Koczak, "You sure hit it on the head!" East German soldiers began stretching the first barbed wire of the actual wall on Aug. 13.

Koczak at this time was in charge of the Eastern Affairs division, as Donovan was taking a vacation in Switzerland. The official U.S. line was that nothing untoward would happen that summer.

The first alert that came to the U.S. mission was that subway service between the sectors had ceased. Koczak dashed into East Berlin at 5 a.m., and later that morning appeared in the war room in the basement of the mission command to brief political and military intelligence groups. He was able to identify the East German police and military units that had taken up stations along the sector border, and he described the barracks they were setting up in sequestered factories and other buildings. This was the first report proving the extensiveness of the operation and its outward East German character.

Koczak argued that as the Soviet Russians were known to be behind the operation, this showed that Moscow was not sure that the West would not react strongly, and wanted to be able to back out without an appreciable loss of face. The wall still was non-existent politically; travelers from West Berlin were not being stopped.

If we failed to act firmly, Koczak insisted, the next red step would be the institution of a fully legal, political wall, and the annexation of East Berlin to the Soviet zone, which the communists had not yet dared to do. Instead, it was the United States that backed down, with barely a pretense at firmness.

Johnson as vice president on Aug. 20 made a strong-sounding speech in which he insisted that we would uphold our rights in West Berlin. The Kremlin at once correctly recognized this as a signal that it could proceed as it desired in East Berlin. Khrushchev had gauged Kennedy's non-reaction accurately. We did nothing. Sixteen months before, he had said of us in an interview, "You spit in their eye but they insist it's only dew."

Johnson the next day took the plane for Hyannis Port to make his report at the Kennedy family home. The reds at the same time proceeded to print the decree of Aug. 22, 1961, giving the Berlin Wall legal and political status. The American, British and French powers now had access to East Berlin only at one point, "checkpoint Charlie," instead of any opening along the 12-mile sector border.

"PRINCETON PACK" IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Koczak had walked into a hornet's nest by his appointment to Berlin. He was interfering with the neat movements of the "Princeton pack," one of the State Department cliques, and the most powerful in the West European area. Major State Department factions are of two categories, those of social, family or university derivation, and those composed of experts on a special political or geographical area.

Lines are not too tightly drawn, and hence these groups are vulnerable to penetration. State-C.I.A. specialists on the Soviet Union obviously come to mind. The public some years ago learned about the pro-red leaning China clique in the State Department.

In addition, what Koczak had not realized was that each of his three superiors involved in his report on the unorthodox phone calls and meetings had a personal reason to hate security. The reason for Donovan's attitude was obvious. Trivers deeply resented the publicity given his brother and sister-in-law Paul and Jane, in the Hollywood communist scandals. Lightner's difficulties were common gossip. Trivers and Lightner, who were Princeton classmates, told Donovan what Koczak had reported, but did not tell Washington.

An annual efficiency record is written on each State Department employee. As fate would have it, it was Donovan who wrote the efficiency report on Koczak for that year. Of course, it was derogatory, declaring that while a brilliant political officer, Koczak engaged in "tale-bearing" that seriously reduced his usefulness in the field. The report was sent our embassy at Bonn, then was recalled by the Berlin mission, and as admitted in a State Department hearing in 1963, some of the original pages were then replaced to eliminate the more abrasive and undiplomatic adjectives, so personal feelings would not be obvious. The document then was backdated. It states that Koczak read it in its entirety, but at the hearing it was admitted that he had not read either version in full.

The way the State Department fires career men is to classify them in the bottom 10 per cent in efficiency, which makes them liable for "selection out," or discharge. Those who gain the disfavor of the top are maneuvered into this position. Anti-communists or those whose analyses have proven uncomfortably accurate but contrary to policy, often secret policy, are likely to be dealt with this way, usually by being shifted to a lowly or out-of-the-way outpost where the best they can do is trivial.

THE GRINDING WHEELS TURN UPON KOZAK

Koczak now found himself in this bottom bracket. He was transferred to Munich, but

before going there, was on home leave when he received notice that he had been "selected out." Another highly rated career man who had the temerity to defend American security suddenly had become sub-standard. The coincidence is far too frequent not to disclose a purposeful pattern.

Koczak recognized these undiscussed elements in his case, so wrote a letter to Secretary of State Rusk asking for a hearing on how his Berlin efficiency rating had come to be written. Only this could open the door to the real facts involving American security. He did not appeal for reinstatement, because no channel is provided for foreign service officers. Only those under civil service have this right. A March 29, 1966 letter to him from Jules Bassin, chief of the functional personnel division, confirmed this, declaring:

"... the Foreign Service Act of 1946 makes no provision to appeal from the Department's decision to retire an officer under Section 633 thereof." This is the "selection out" provision.

Actually, no hearing was held in the true sense of the word. The official reference is to a "special board," and Koczak verbally was told of "a board of inquiry." All that happened was that the main figures, with some others, were summoned individually before a three-man panel composed of Richard D. Kearney, deputy legal advisor, as chairman, Norris S. Haselton, inspector general, and Col. Francis P. Miller, of the bureau of educational and cultural affairs. Each of those called gave a deposition. There could be no cross-examination, as each person was heard individually.

The loaded, highhanded pattern for internal inquiries in the State Department is graphically demonstrated by this case. Of course, without the security angle, it became meaningless. The panel's written report flatly states that the issue of security was not considered by the board. Koczak, since his appearance on May 10, 1963, has not been permitted to check the text of his testimony, a routine formality.

The written report without the depositions finally was shown to Koczak on Dec. 22, 1964, a year and three months after being written. He declares it plainly confirms that he had not been shown his full efficiency report. In addition, it declares his work in Hungary and Israel during the crises there should have been rewarded. But the report did not go into any details of his or the mission's work in Berlin. It expressly regrets that the foreign service has lost a fine officer.

CURIOUS MONTHLY DELAYS IN HIS RETIREMENT

During this period, Koczak received brief, monthly memos telling him that his retirement had been put off for a month. He was unable to obtain anything else written, which was puzzling until realized that it was the period of intensive inquiry by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee into the Otepka case. The State Department took no chance that the subcommittee would discover a link between the plight of Koczak and the Otepka case. Actually a link exists. Donovan's name appears in the Otepka case testimony.

On Jan. 27, 1964, Victor H. Dikeos, who had been a security officer in Warsaw, testified that he "had heard" that Donovan, in the words of Julien G. Sourwine, chief counsel, "was reported to have been compromised while he was in Warsaw by a Polish female or females." The Scarbeck case was of that date.

On Dec. 31, 1963, Koczak received a phone call from the office of William J. Crockett, then deputy undersecretary of state, informing him that his "selection out" had been cancelled. No reason was given. Koczak was told that his efficiency rating for the period in dispute was now "non-rate." Thus, the issue was being straddled. Koczak drew comfort, nonetheless, from what appeared obvious, that his adverse rating had been dropped. This was the logical conclusion, but not for

the State Department. He discovered that his negative rating in the Berlin efficiency report was being retained at the same time.

Koczak was given a make-work job in the historical department, dealing with chronologies. His Munich assignment had been cancelled. Then in 1964, he was "selected out" again, and given another make-work task in the office of personnel. This dragged on until January, 1966, when he was retired. Koczak was without a job for a year, then in February, 1967 was employed as assistant director of research by the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO. (400 First St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001), the largest federal employees' union in the nation.

The significance of the Koczak case does not lie just in an appeal for reinstatement, although he is seeking this vindication. He has put this affair into the hands of a lawyer, Marion Edwyn Harrison (1750 Pennsylvania Ave., Washington, D.C. 20006), who has been querying the State Department without being answered. The case touches, too, on the broad subject of security. But directly involved is the manner by which the State Department makes foreign policy, and how it staffs key posts. This makes it part of a complex of such cases, including those of Otto F. Otepka and David G. Nes.

"STAR CHAMBER" AND RIGGING OF RECORDS

Some segments of the press recognized the basic issues involved. Clark Mollenhoff, of the Cowles publications, the first to cover the story, was concerned over the State Department's "star chamber" proceedings, the rigging of official records, and the denial of due process of law to employees. Leslie H. Whitten, of Hearst Headline Service, reported how Koczak was "railroaded into retirement," and how we muffed the opportunity to prevent the building of the Berlin Wall. He was the first to provide these details from an authoritative, American source. Edith Kermit Roosevelt, in a number of her weekly columns, dealt with policy manipulation, misuse of records, and peculiar personnel selection. The Government Employees Exchange, Sidney Goldberg's tabloid fortnightly, forcefully put the case into proper context inside the framework of federal personnel merit programming. He made this part of a virtual crusade.

In the Congress, Koczak has held many consultations. Congressman John M. Ashbrook has dealt with the case on the floor, demanding inquiry into "the system" at State Department. Well, we shall see.

Dr. Philip R. Lee's Appointment a Step to Better Health for the American People

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor to chair a special subcommittee on investigating the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with the purpose of studying the Government's administration in the health field.

From that report came a recommendation of a reorganization of the health field within the Government which would bring all facets under a single unit under the Secretary.

I was pleased to see that these recommendations are being acted on. I refer to the action taken this week which realigns our health efforts for a coordinated national goal.

I am also pleased by the selection of Dr. Philip R. Lee, a dedicated and highly qualified man, to his new position.

The appointment of Dr. Lee and the initiation of this new reorganization is a step we have long needed. I feel confident that this is only the beginning of a program which will offer the American public better and more efficient health services.

Through the years, Congress has passed a vast number of laws in the health field, a majority of which are the responsibility of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The appointment of someone to coordinate these programs has been long overdue. However, in assigning the responsibility to Dr. Lee, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has given the job to an individual with the experience and ability to carry it out. As a physician, medical administrator, developer of national policies on health, and experienced Government administrator, Dr. Lee should be able to give the assignment the kind of thorough consideration and direction it needs and deserves. He is ideally suited for the job, the results of which can only benefit our Nation.

Secretary Wirtz and the Sidney Hillman Award

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have spent a great many years going to dinners for people in public life. Fund raising dinners, testimonial dinners, award dinners—the whole gamut of dinners at which indigestible food is followed by bad rhetoric. At this point in my career, I am glad I do not have to go to them all, anymore.

But there is one kind of dinner that I would recommend unqualifiedly to anyone—and that is any dinner at which Willard Wirtz is going to speak. Consistently the most articulate man in Washington, he is often the most thought provoking. His speeches are free of clichés, and they are filled with both ideas and respectfully constructed sentences. And the latter are rarer than the former in this town.

Secretary Wirtz was at the top of his form on March 13 when he received the Sidney Hillman Award for meritorious public service. That award, which has been conferred in the past on such people as Harry Truman and Eleanor Roosevelt, is not given so lightly that its presentation to Willard Wirtz was a routine matter. The Hillman Foundation has greatly honored the Secretary of Labor in offering it, and he has greatly honored all of us in his years of service and in his dedication to finding out how the public interest can best be served by public instruments.

As was customary, Secretary Wirtz' remarks were not casual banalities on March 13. As is his custom, he spoke from the heart and he spoke to the problems

which most directly confront the American people. He spoke about the Riot Commission and its report, and he called eloquently and persuasively for a total commitment to the elimination of the conditions which that report showed are eating away at the soul of the Nation.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I place Secretary Wirtz' eloquent remarks of March 13 at this point in the RECORD.

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF LABOR WILLARD WIRTZ UPON HIS ACCEPTANCE OF THE SIDNEY HILLMAN MERITORIOUS AWARD, PRESENTED BY THE SIDNEY HILLMAN FOUNDATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 13, 1968

They are thankless fates who conspire to put a recipient of the Sidney Hillman award to the embarrassment of having to play hooky to accept it, from a still futile attempt to settle an eight-month-old labor dispute.

Were Sidney Hillman presiding here tonight, however, in person as he is in spirit, he would direct our attention to that other form of serious strain and controversy within the nation today which involves even more of what he considered essentially important in the achievement of human equity.

He would put to us the sobering, searing "basic conclusion" of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders:

"Our nation is moving today toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal."

Hillman might digress a moment to recall the similar passage which would have been part of the dialogue in the Yeshiva at Kovno in 1901, among the young men who were imprisoned three years later as . . . "revolutionaries" in Kovno's prison, and then in his uncle's home in Manchester where he went in exile in 1906, still only a boy of nineteen. This was Disraeli's description of mid-19th century England:

"Two nations—the rich and the poor—between whom there is no intercourse and no sympathy; who are as ignorant of each others' habits, thoughts, and feelings, as if they were dwellers in different planets; who are formed by a different breeding, are fed by a different food, are ordered by different manners, and are not governed by the same laws."

Then Hillman would get directly down to business.

Is the Report of the Commission too strong? Does it go too far? His answer would be what he said at a meeting of the Amalgamated Executive Board on May 7, 1940:

"People love to not perceive danger. People love to believe that things are not bad because if things are really bad we have to do something about them."

There was more at that same meeting that is relevant. Hillman was talking, the minutes indicate, about the great social gains that had been achieved by the forces of liberalism in America; and he said this:

"It will be a sorry day for labor and the nation if at this critical hour we permit division among the liberal groups whose unity made these gains possible. *The reactionaries never divide. They always hang together. The great misfortune in the past has been that liberal groups could not remain united.* It is our great obligation to keep progressives and liberals united or we are going to lose a great deal of what we have gained in the past few years."

It is already apparent in the reception the Civil Disorders Commission Report has received how important today, with respect to this gravest domestic concern, is this balance Hillman described—between the weak but united forces of reaction and the superior but divided forces of liberalism.

The "inactionaries"—to soften Hillman's phrase a little without really changing it—have immediately and unequivocally taken

their position regarding the Report. They are against it—united against it. It not only indicates the status quo with unprecedented sharpness, but charges the offense primarily to the "pillars of society." And it demands action—massive action—now. So all the forces of inaction—or reaction—are united instantly and automatically against it—the forces of false pride and false economy, of bigotry, of ignorance, of egotism, of selfishness, of fear. They don't need a battle plan. All who say NO, regardless of their reasons, are at once effective allies.

And the liberals?

Why, we support the Report.

"In general" that is. This is the rub. We know the Report is essentially right—that any weaker report would have been wrong—a disservice—dangerous. But we have different qualifications and reservations about it—and, more significantly, different ideas about what to do to meet the problem itself. This makes sense—for the right answers are by no means clear. Yet this is also exactly what Sidney Hillman was talking about that day at the Executive Board.

I suggest, tonight, only one element in what seems to me the necessary affirmative response to the Commission Report, but that element which will determine whether the forces of liberalism can be effectively mustered in its support.

It is in form a report, with recommendations, to the President. It will be effective only as it is recognized as essentially a report to the American people.

So long as attention is centered, as it has been so far, only on its proposals for government action and programs, the Report will serve principally only as a sharper focus for controversy. The real question is what response it will evoke from people as individuals.

Among the enemies of the Report will be those "liberals" who read it, nod their heads gravely, think how nice it is to have pled guilty, to have sent up a mea culpa, and who then say in effect: "OK. It was our fault. We have apologized. Now let's shake hands and forget it."

Standing next to them will be those whose reaction is one of rejoicing that it has now been made clear what the Government is to do, so the rest of us can stop worrying about it.

This Report will be effective only as there is recognition that behind all the analyses, programs and policies lies a much deeper question—what sort of society are we to be in America? Do we accept a sort of drift towards factual *Apartheid*? Do we see ourselves as racists? Do we believe value and opportunity ought to depend upon pigmentation? No government, no laws can answer these questions for us. They are *our* questions, asking for *our* answers.

In theory, of course, we know the answers we ought to give as Americans. We were the first known community to derive its existence not from nation or geography or history but from a "proposition" that all men are created equal.

We are moreover a community deeply rooted in the religious tradition that equal metaphysical value belongs to all human souls, in which the neighbor is "another self." If we aspire to greatness from heritage, we cannot be racists. It would be, to put it at the most worldly level, "un-American." In the roots of the soul, it would deny the Kingdom of God.

But these aspirations become operating principles only in the decisions of citizens. It is not enough—although it is a lot—to pass laws. For laws that are not deeply and creatively observed do no more than constrain the grosser breaches of the rules. They are valuable. They set limits. They prevent us from enduring the iron hopelessness of formal *Apartheid*. But we know from the laws about education that a real breakthrough to full racial equity lies beyond the

reach of courts. We come back to citizens. What will we do? What will you do?

The risk of hateful racism in this country goes far beyond the issues that law or legislation can reach. Of course we must have the jobs. Of course we must re-fashion our center cities and break the intolerable restrictions on housing. But our "minorities" could still then have to move about in an unaccepting and wounding environment. There is demanded of the majority, who to an overwhelming extent command the riches, the opportunity and the power in their community, a more personal dedication to the achievement of civil rights. Without this, the statutes may be in the books, but they will not be in the cities.

The prerequisite to a deeper conversion to the cause of racial equality is knowledge—not of statistics—the "facts that are often the enemies of truth"—but knowledge of living facts.

I plead that the Commission report be read—in schools, in colleges, in homes. There are so many false stereotypes growing up—of lawless rioters, arsonists, do-nothing no-goods lounging about on welfare or producing inconceivable numbers of illegitimate children. Let us at least know the facts—the trap of the ghetto when jobs move out and workers cannot follow—a 30 percent unemployment rate—rat-ridden tenements. Most Americans have never set foot in a ghetto and have no conception of the chasm between the neat white-single-family houses—often built with a federal mortgage—and the barns in the center-cities—built in the 1860's and now housing their third or fourth immigration of the unskilled and the poor. Then, knowing the facts, let us as individuals ask our conscience what we could have made of ourselves in such conditions and whether the worst nightmare we can think of is that a child of ours should have to suffer that fate. And if not our child, why any child? Are other children less innocent, less helpless, less deserving by some fatal congenital flaw of a share in America's abundance?

But knowledge, understanding, conviction—these are only self-serving conceits until they are translated into action.

The race problem—the Negro problem—and now, as identified in this report, the White problem—will be worked out only as the people who are the problem—which is all of us—participate in its solution.

Paying taxes to support the necessary programs is essential—but it isn't enough.

Voting for candidates who will in turn vote for the necessary programs is essential—but it isn't enough.

The most important immediate necessity in this area is the adoption by the House of Representatives of the Fair Housing provisions which the Senate has now approved. For a Nation to receive the Civil Disorders Commission's Report and then to reject this legislation would be unanswerable hypocrisy. If every person in this audience would commit himself tonight to do everything in his power to see to it that his Congressman voted right on this bill, then we would indeed have honored Sidney Hillman. But that wouldn't be enough.

This is a problem of human, individual relations—not essentially a legal problem—not essentially an economic problem—but a problem of individuals' relationships with individuals. And its solution cannot be delegated to government or to policemen or to the law or to anyone else.

Any suggestion that it is hard for the individual to know what to do, how to participate, is largely evasion.

There is the simple thing of common decency—just the shared greeting, the friendly word and smile, the thanks for help, the natural social encounter. If this small change of good will could pass more freely *both ways* what a difference it would make. But not nearly enough.

There is the chance today for any indi-

vidual—black or white—who really wants to, to take an active, significant part in the private, voluntary efforts now under way in every community in the country to make this not two societies, but one.

I think, as just one illustrative instance, of the neighborhood and church groups who have undertaken voluntary desegregation of housing in their districts and then presided over it to prevent the kind of panic selling, often encouraged by less scrupulous real estate dealers, which makes desegregation into "that period between the arrival of the first Negro home-owner and the departure of the last white." Balance is possible. Citizens have worked at and achieved it. Could not a voluntary citizen movement of this kind in every big city match the new housing laws not with ill will, resentment and even worse race relations, but with a genuine achievement of acceptance and social solidarity?

In education, one of the most successful innovations of the Poverty Programs has been the effects that can be achieved from volunteer coaching: through Headstart, counseling for high school children, working among drop-outs to get them either back to school or on to junior college. For any citizen with some energy and some teaching experience, here is a direct way of contributing to fewer barriers and more opportunities. Any break in the chain can set in motion a more general liberation. It sometimes takes surprisingly little to release the bright spark of hope and curiosity in a young mind clobbered to passivity by the cumulative evils of the underprivileged.

Can we, over this next critical decade, change not only legislation but citizens' reactions to legislation? Can we pass from a formal rejection of apartheid to an active, dedicated rejection? Can we make equality not a begrudged nuisance but an operating ideal?

No reports, no statutes, no laws can answer these questions any more than they can guarantee us our full flowering as a free society. They are limitations, guidelines, restraints to prevent the worst. The citizens themselves can achieve the best.

This is the challenge of the Commission's Report—to move in time beyond the formal structures of a free society to one that is *lived* "in spirit and in truth."

I think the challenge is clear, but I think it's going to take all the best that's in us; for while it's true that law can eliminate the worst abuses, it's also true that citizens alone can accomplish the great results which we want to accomplish.

Picking up a little of what George Meany said, I'm getting awful tired of speeches and everything else discussing only the somber side of everything that's before us.

I don't think of that Report of the Civil Disorders Commission as an apocalyptic judgment upon the way we're going. Nor do I think that anybody really believes we are moving toward two societies. I think we all feel that it was a great thing we were warned of that danger and that the Commission's report would have been a disservice if it had been weaker. It would have done real injury. It would have been dangerous. It would have done harm. Yet the hardest thing for me to reconcile in my own mind is exactly what George Meany was saying: how in the world is it that we can get so troubled about so many things when, at the same time, we're making so much progress on so many different fronts?

I sometimes think that we're at the point we find ourselves in when, in a restaurant, somebody starts talking, then somebody starts talking a little louder, until, finally, the noise in the room, is accelerated to bedlam, just because somebody started talking a little bit louder. It seems to be a little that way today, as far as problems and troubles are concerned.

I believe the fairest judgment is that more

progress has been made in the area that we're talking about in the last two years or the last five years than in the previous two centuries or the previous five centuries. I believe it's fair and legitimate to take counsel of our gains, as well as of our problems and all that lies behind us.

I know it's sometimes hard. Some of you may know I had an experience just this last week with a group of boys coming into my office, when I wasn't there, and taking over the office, because they wanted approval of a \$750,000 project. I'm not over being mad about it yet, but I hope there's some way of resolving the situation equitably despite the youths' approach, which makes it infinitely more complicated to look at it in a decent fashion. I hope I'll get over that affront—partly to my pride, partly to my personal property, by a group of boys and girls whose human rights have been kicked around for quite a long time. I don't think it's easy.

Their manners were bad at my office that day. Some were out of school. Their teachers were up on the Hill filing their form of protest. I was away from the office engaged in trying to mediate an eight-month copper strike in which copper companies and copper unions, entirely within the law, have pressed their respective positions, even at the price of the country's going without domestic copper for eight months.

Now, these lines are a little fuzzy in my mind and they can't be very clear to those kids. And yet with all of the depth of feeling about their actions, I can say I'm glad that it's out in the open where we can deal with it, and that if those are the feelings and they've got to be stopped and there just can't be any compromise with it, I'm glad we've got it out where we can work on it and find out what the right answer is.

There must be both law and order and human equity, and we won't get one without the other. Anybody who attends to only one of the two isn't going to be very much help, and so I'm glad to see a problem of that kind come out where we can deal with it.

I don't feel in the least bit depressed about any of the problems, individually or even totally, that we face. I can't think of any other time in history that I'd rather be alive. I can't believe that there has ever been before a larger opportunity to leave the world a little better than it was when we came into it. In my view, we can't say that nothing is being gained. It seems to me that more is being gained than ever before. I'll close with the words of that native American Philosopher, Pogo—the creation of Walt Kelly—who comes closer to putting his finger—or paw—on these points than anybody else I can think of. As "Pogo" said not too long ago, our problem is that we face "insurmountable opportunity." Well, you know, it's about right.

For the first time the human competence includes the capacity to perfect the ideal of life. Part of our trouble now is that suddenly, because we realize there is so much more that we could do, we stop measuring our gains by past achievements and, instead, measure them by what we realize is our capacity. We're faced, just exactly as "Pogo" said, with a problem of "insurmountable opportunity" and we're having the doggondest time facing up to it.

On another day—and I hate to rely so much on a single source—"Pogo" suggested in a paraphrase of a very old phrase, and one which seems to sum up the whole: "We have met the enemy and he is us."

Well, that means, among other things, that we are bound to win. I think Pogo had a smile on his face when he said that. I don't think he said it in despair. I find in the Report of the Civil Disorders Commission a presentation of insurmountable opportunities which we're going to have trouble taking advantage of, but an identification, too, of the fact that whatever enemy there is, is us and that's the one enemy we can beat.

Thanks very much.

Innovative Effects of the Alliance for Progress

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday I had the privilege of introducing Mr. Covey T. Oliver, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and U.S. Coordinator, Alliance for Progress, to the Annual Institute on Recent Innovations in Business Transactions in Latin America. The meeting was held at the Statler Hilton Plaza Hotel in Miami Beach, Fla.

In his informative and eloquent address, Mr. Oliver pointed out that Latin America is now enjoying an unprecedented period of political stability directly resulting from our Alliance efforts. This factor and other tremendous benefits which have come from the Alliance have produced great opportunities for the businessman. As Mr. Oliver says:

Latin America today has achieved sufficient stability to justify detailed investigation of long-term investment opportunities.

Because of the significance of his expert views, I insert the text of his remarks at this point in the Record:

INNOVATIVE EFFECTS OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(Address by Covey T. Oliver, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and U.S. Coordinator, Alliance for Progress, to the Annual Institute on Recent Innovations in Business Transactions in Latin America, Statler Hilton Plaza Hotel, Miami, Beach, Fla., March 15, 1968)

Personally, I should have liked nothing better than to have come to this meeting to give a professional paper as a man teaching a law school course on International Transactions Practice and to absorb from my brethren ideas and insights to pass on to my students. As it is, I do not have the time or the freedom to contribute specifically to your deliberations, although I am taking almost full advantage of my time here to learn from you. Here I have the generalist's role; but it is not an unimportant one, because in it I can tell you why I think that what you are doing or preparing yourselves to do in counseling and guiding transnational business is of vital importance to the future of the nation and the hemisphere.

Our current relations with American governments in our Home Hemisphere are defined by the revolutionary precepts and goals of the Alliance for Progress. Seven years ago, we and our allies made a new departure in our attitudes toward inter-American affairs. We devised and continue to devise innovative techniques to enable us to reach our goal of the total development of a continent and its peoples—a development that will bring all American nations into fruitful participation in the technological and scientific benefits now available to developed countries and at the same time bring a better life in stable, democratic societies to the millions in our hemisphere who have been neglected for centuries.

Before we could accept the Alliance way, we in the United States had to rethink our national interest and recast our hemispheric role. It was necessary for us to be willing to become involved with our neighbors in closely-knit, continuous ways and to work with them on difficult problems, far beyond those of mutual defense which had drawn us together in the war years. Also, we had to come to see that the ills afflicting the ma-

majority of American nations would not be cured in time by "natural" or "normal" forces and efforts. Thus, the Alliance became the next great step after the Good Neighbor Policy. In many ways it was a more significant, certainly a more difficult step for us to take. But it was an essential one.

On their part, our American allies in development had to understand that their societies were in urgent need of wide-ranging social, political and economic reform. They had to realize that unless this reform was initiated and supported by all sectors of their societies, public and private, the demand for change would degenerate into violence that would threaten the peace and security of the whole hemisphere.

Inherent in the decision by the member nations of the Alliance to accept new roles to carry out the vast development plan was the realization that the intimate cooperation required would entail opening some key aspects of national affairs to transnational disclosure and consideration. Alliance nations realize that true collaboration for hemispheric development requires the establishment of regional norms for self-help, mutually acceptable multinational supervision of development projects, and uniformly just treatment of foreign investments, to mention just a few. It could almost be said that the acceptance of this great change from national isolation has been the most innovative of all the revolutionary effects of the Alliance for Progress.

Innovating in foreign affairs, as Secretary Rusk has pointed out, can be a risky business. Bold, new departures such as the Alliance for Progress bring new problems as well as new opportunities.

Some of the new problems which challenge the best minds the Alliance nations have available are:

1. Increased dangers of misunderstanding as we move beyond traditional international relations into new relationships of intensive hemisphere involvement.

An assertion energetically made in true belief that it is wholesome for development may be taken as a demand, or even as an ultimatum of sorts. Or, the idea may not be valid for the local condition but the proposition is uniform or insensitive to this.

2. Growing unrest as old, inequitable societal structures weaken and new systems have yet to take strong root. Can our nations advance fast enough to keep ahead of rising expectations resulting from our first efforts under the Alliance?

3. The need to refine or redirect our goals and programs as the Alliance moves on, in spite of inertia, bureaucratic and other.

I am sure, however, that a quick glance at what we have already achieved during Phase I more than justifies a good measure of optimism that the Alliance will prevail.

1. Latin America is now enjoying an unprecedented period of political stability directly resulting from our Alliance efforts. No nation in the area has suffered an extra-constitutional change of government for the past twenty-two months, compared to an average of three such changes annually for the preceding 36 years.

2. Food production on a regional basis has kept pace with the fastest growing population in the world.

3. More and better schools, new roads, burgeoning cooperatives and increased technical competence built up during the first phase of the Alliance now enable our developing neighbors to absorb and make better use of funds which can lead to even greater development rates and benefit greater numbers of people.

We are progressing. And, it must be remembered, many of our allies are advancing in the teeth of increased efforts by alien and alien-supported insurgents to impose tyrannical systems by armed subversion.

Now, how does this revolutionary departure called the Alliance for Progress relate to the entrepreneur, the American—and I mean Pan-American—businessman?

First of all, the Alliance needs his total and sincere support for its premises and goals. Unlike the nostrums of demagogues, the Alliance does not ask one sector to bear the complete burden of development, nor does it contemplate forcing those who have the most to share their wealth indiscriminately with those who have nothing. Simplistic redistribution is no solution. There must be greater productivity, more efficient exchanges of goods and services, and more equitable sharing of total benefits.

It is obvious that if the developing nations of our hemisphere are to advance on all fronts as quickly as possible—and they must do so very quickly—they cannot afford to alienate or destroy those very sectors which, for a number of reasons, have the greatest experience in national and international business and the most modern tools available to the society. Rather, these advanced sectors must be brought fully into the development effort.

It is accepted dogma in the violent revolutionary theories that anyone who benefited significantly under the unjust societal structures of the past is a reactionary—a human barrier to true social reform in the Americas. Many, many—too many—who should be involved in the Alliance still believe that those who have prospered are evil, selfish, uncaring. The burden of persuasion that this is not the case still lies with the well-off in poor societies. It must be met—and in those societies themselves—by precept and by example.

While we must admit that such attitudes certainly do exist and must be overcome, it would be wrong and self-defeating to make the successful entrepreneur the pariah in our development scheme. Indeed, the Inter-American Council for Commerce and Production (CICYP), which lists among its members some of the most successful of Pan-American businessmen, is among the leaders of hemispheric organizations seeking ways to add their strength to our development efforts.

That is the way it should be. That is the way it must be if the Alliance for Progress is to succeed.

As our nations move into the institution-building and reform era (Phase II) of the Alliance and beyond to the economic integration of more than twenty diverse economies during Phase III, they will depend increasingly on the entrepreneur to provide the great investments and skills needed in industry, in agriculture and commerce. Businessmen must help foresee and plan for the temporary inequalities and imbalances that will come with integration. Developing American countries must be able to count on private persons and entities to contribute new ideas, trained managers and technicians and new tools if they are to consolidate what they have already gained and build more rapidly toward total development.

Many, probably most, of our Alliance allies still face two major problems in this regard. First they must be able to convince potential investors that their countries have acquired sufficient political and economic stability. Secondly, they must re-educate their own peoples to accept the fact that foreign capital, when used wisely and justly, can play a crucial role in rapid national and regional development.

In general, I believe that Latin America today has achieved sufficient stability to justify detailed investigation of long-term investment opportunities. I think this stability will continue to improve, even though we must expect occasional lapses.

Perhaps less advance has been made on reaching a regional or even national con-

sensus on the proper role and fair treatment of foreign private capital. Too many, unfortunately, are willing to ignore more basic problems and heap the blame for stagnation and failure on a visibly successful foreign investor. Yet, this too is changing. Today, for instance, nineteen of our Alliance partners have reached an investment guarantee agreement with this country to protect our investors from at least some of the major risks involved in investment in developing countries.

The role I see for the foreign investor in Latin America is as new there as the Alliance approach is in international relations.

The modern foreign investor should be willing to accept a development role. He should be willing to look beyond this year's profit-and-loss sheets to consider the effect of his endeavors on national and regional development efforts. This, if successful, will increase many-fold his returns in the future. He must actively search for labor-intensive projects that will ease the great strain of underemployment in most areas as well as work to his own profit. He should explore and even suggest joint-ownership arrangements and managerial and technical training programs that will add to the region's pool of administrators and technicians. He must be willing to adjust to more effective enforcement of tax and other laws, as developing states improve their administrative capabilities.

And perhaps most important of all, the foreign businessman working in Latin America must find some way to inculcate into his Latin American counterpart at all levels a similar concern for the well-being of the community—a similar sense of responsibility for neighbors who are less fortunate.

Perhaps you will have noted that for the past few minutes I have spoken of "foreign investors," not "United States foreign investors." I have done this, in part, because many of you serve the investment communities of other countries as well. But I also want to make this point: most of what I have talked about as "revolution" in foreign investment is not revolutionary for American investment at home. For our investors, participating in change in Latin America will not be as difficult as it will be for some others, because American business is the world's most advanced on social as well as other fronts. As our own modern business viewpoints continue to move out from the home base into the Home Hemisphere, great new forces for betterment, comparable to those at work here, will be set in motion. The results will not always be the same in form as here; just think of what we can help add to total development as time goes on! I list just these:

1. A keen sense of the importance of the modernization of the market process itself, including attention to the now largely neglected problems of almost medieval restrictive trade practices;
2. Private, non-sectarian philanthropy, still almost unknown in Latin America, except from North American sources;
3. "Pure" research by business, with no immediate pay-out in mind;
4. Business retirement systems;
5. Customer and consumer relations;
6. Quality control;
7. Planning and systems management;
8. The longer view ahead, including the economic integration of Latin America;
9. Widely-distributed stock ownership;
10. Assumption of a fair share, justly determined, of the social costs of civilization;
11. Decentralization of responsibility, so important in the public sector as well;
12. "Corporate Democracy", instead of "Tycoon Tyranny."

We in Government are trying to get more men and more ideas from our universities and "think tanks" on the vital social and

political fronts of the Alliance for Progress. In the meantime, we must think for ourselves, not only about helping inculcate "grass roots democracy" under Title IX of the Foreign Assistance Act, but also about nation and regionwide improvement possibilities.

You can help greatly, even outside the important field of economic development, for my twelve points above are also a part of social and political development. We in government are required, for reasons we all must accept, to deal mainly with governments in the development process. And public assistance inputs are marginal. There is so much, qualitatively as well as quantitatively, that only you can do.

Please keep trying—and try even harder!

A National Health Insurance Plan

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to address the Health Claim Association of Greater New York recently at its annual seminar meeting in New York City. I hope my remarks will interest my colleagues as we begin the difficult task of reassessing the role of the Federal Government in improving the nation's health care system. My speech follows:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE HEALTH CLAIM ASSOCIATION OF GREATER NEW YORK, AT THE PARK SHERATON HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, MARCH 14, 1968

I hope that I have understood correctly your invitation to me, as a Member of Congress, to address representatives of the health insurance industry. My concern tonight is for our common interest in improving our health care system.

We all sense, I believe, that the federal government's relation to the insurance industry in general, and to its health insurance segment in particular, poses a paradox which must certainly confuse and confound us all.

Frankly, it confuses and confounds me. For example, we have in this country a legislative tradition that the regulation of insurance companies is a matter reserved to the states. Yet the federal government is the carrier of the largest insurance program in the world—the Social Security System—with over 100 million participants.

We have further a tradition that the private sector, including the health insurance industry, is best equipped to improve its operation by competition and cooperation among its representatives—yet the federal government is now sponsoring, even forcing, a major reexamination of private health insurance programs.

We have finally, to underline this paradox, persistent belief in this country that government regulation of medicine is evil and to be avoided at any cost. Yet the federal government, partly through its role in medical research, and partly because it focuses national concern on welfare, is the center today of a legislative and administrative ferment on our national health care which promises to have profound effects on every aspect of American medicine.

Let me comment on each aspect of this paradox which involves you and me, as

representatives of private insurance, and the federal government, respectively.

Our federal government's role in social welfare is a reluctant one. This country has never been a leader in social legislation and we are usually far behind other countries.

Our approach to welfare issues—conceiving that word broadly—has been marked historically by three stages:

First, the initial federal involvement in welfare issues comes late—and long after problems have been both clearly identified and well advanced in their threat to the general welfare.

Next, first stage federal legislation is basically modest despite the cry for more drastic solutions, or perhaps because of it.

In the final stage, after federal legislation is enacted, and despite predictions of disaster from those who oppose any federal intervention, we learn that the new programs are both too modest and irreversible. Then, the law is slowly broadened over successive years.

These three stages—delayed response, modest legislation, and then strengthening amendments, can, for example, be found in the Social Security Act itself and in federal aid to education. I see in the present early stages of the federal approach to medical care the same patterns.

If my view is correct, and if you are as perceptive as I know insurance people are, you will see lessons in applying this outline to future health care problems.

Let me apply these three stages and see what we get:

We are already well into stage one of identifying the crisis. Americans have been educated to accept their doctors and their medical services as the best in the world. Obvious discrepancies between this institutional advertising and one's personal experience were usually dismissed as exceptions. This lack of realism is now shattered by the frequency with which doctors themselves discuss our persistently inferior ratings in the crucial health indices: infant mortality and life expectancy.

America ranks 21st among nations in life expectancy at birth for males. We are behind such nations as Malta, France and Spain, and much farther behind such medically advanced countries as Denmark and Sweden.

Our infant mortality rate is 18th among countries reported by World Health Organization, after such countries as Czechoslovakia and Taiwan. We could have over 40,000 young lives a year if we matched the health record of the Netherlands.

These national averages, by their statistical nature, smother an even more damaging indictment: our medical services for the poor, for the Negro, and for the rural resident are much below those mediocre national averages.

These great social and geographical disparities mean that metropolitan middle-class residents, disturbed and annoyed by overcrowded waiting rooms, delayed medical appointments, and assembly-line examining and diagnosis techniques and treatment are relatively well-off compared to the simple lack of doctors and basic medical facilities endured by the poor.

A presidential commission last year said that rural health service "is badly organized, under financed, rarely related to the needs of the individual or the family."

These assessments of our health care system were never secret. But the federal government's attention—including the President's—is now focussed on them.

The President's health care proposals of last week are another example of this new awareness. I can assure you that there will be even more sweeping recommendations made by Members of Congress.

The American people and their Congress will no longer tolerate a system where their

tax dollars finance most medical research but have almost no influence on a costly, unequal and inefficient health care system. They will wonder, as I do, why public funds for research are good but a public role in health care raises charges of socialism.

Now we are about to enter the second stage in the pattern of welfare legislative history. We can anticipate that the laws passed by Congress will not put you—the private health insurance carriers—out of business, at least not this year.

The laws we will pass will be modest compared to the health care problems I cited.

But we should not forget the third stage of health care legislation still in the future: the federal government will, I believe, expand and intensify its health care programs over the next 20 years so that none of us in this room will recognize that new system.

Does this mean that your companies—insofar as they handle health insurance, and your jobs, will cease to exist in twenty years?

Perhaps. If I had a son finishing his education this year, and if he had a job offer from one of your companies, my advice would be: Don't go into that business unless you are prepared to rebuild it.

Rebuilding means starting with something that exists and ending with something quite different. Are you prepared for such an effort? Are you prepared, for example, not only to accept a compulsory health insurance program, as has been proposed in this state recently, but to create a plan to build and run such a system?

Are you prepared to divert your enormous capital investments, for example, into group practice hospitals which you should help design and operate?

Are you prepared to lobby for group practice even at the cost of antagonizing some doctors and some state legislatures because you realize that more people can thus get better and cheaper medical care?

I don't expect you to take my advice on your goals for the next two decades. I only suggest that you don't settle for the lowest common denominator that any of you can agree on.

Listen to these views from the report of last fall's National Conference on Private Health Insurance:

"A strong view developed that prepayment systems should not act to suppress or deter changes in the economics of paying for care—that the system should not limit payment to fee-for-service but admit alternatives such as capitation payments."

Or to this, from the same forthcoming report:

"Private health insurance, which is paying over \$10 billion a year for care provided by the nation's health care industry, must accept greater responsibility for fashioning the system it supports."

And to this:

There was a consensus "that greater flexibility is needed in the methods by which public and private funds are merged in payment-for-service."

My friends, these are radical thoughts for the insurance industry. I hope you are ready for this revolution. Frankly, many in Congress are not, but we are moving. If you accept as a legislative model what has happened in the past, you must be prepared to stay ahead of Congress and of the federal government in proposing changes in your field.

You should learn from the example set by the American Medical Association. Don't oppose progressive legislation and then try to profit from its passage. The AMA did just that and has not yet, and may never, recover its prestige as a result.

Let me propose a specific alternate course

for your industry. I suggest that you end the broad discussions about national comprehensive health insurance plans. Forget the interesting but unproductive questions about their feasibility and desirability. Abandon also your fears that self-serving politicians may force the American people into some kind of national health insurance plan.

Instead, do it yourself. Aside from the federal government, only your industry has the experience to create a national health insurance plan. I need not underline the advantages for you if you initiate the effort.

A national health insurance plan would have to take the measure of these problems:

The urgent need for pre- and post-natal care for all American women; this constitutes the only recognized approach to reduction of both infant and maternal mortality;

The need for prepayment of medical charges. Health care coverage is not like accident or other casualty underwriting. We need a system of financing both the care itself, which everyone requires, and equally important, preventive medicine which is indispensable to the highest standards of health which this nation needs and deserves;

Finally, a national health plan would provide a mechanism for proper financing under controls, and under constant review, of the nation's health care vendors. Unless health care faces the same cost-benefit approach which is accepted in other major endeavors, we will fall farther and farther behind in the race between health needs and health costs.

Such a plan, from you, the experts, will attract attention both for your initiative and for the proposals themselves. What you recommend may not be the final result; but a solution may well be written without your participation if you resist the idea of a national health insurance plan.

A national health plan, insured by both public and private mechanisms, would revolutionize our health care. It would make the products of our exquisitely refined and polished research mechanism available to all Americans. It would reach into every ghetto of this country, into every mountain town, and into every isolated farm community with health protection. It would finance a proliferation of neighborhood health clinics, both urban and rural. It would provide desperately needed competition for excellence among doctors. And it could provide a role for continuing participation by private carriers.

This plan is a vision today. But it will be fulfilled. The American people will no longer tolerate the view, expressed recently by the President of the AMA, that health care is a privilege and not a right. Nor will it tolerate lower health care standards at increasingly higher prices.

If the fee-for-service system isn't working well, it must go, unless the nation's insurers can control it. If the federal government must report to the people that there is no alternative to a completely government-run insurance plan, you can be sure we will not shrink from it. And if these prospects alarm you or the medical community, my answer is that you should respond with something better before our positions become fixed.

My advice to you is to lead and not follow. If Congress is forced, by public indignation over an inadequate health care system, to act on its own, it will refashion it without your participation. It will become the reluctant dragon killer.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that Congress will reconstitute, in a sweeping way, the federal role in our health care system to match its considerable, and proper financing of medical research.

If I am right in this assessment, and if you are responsive to your own progressive forces who ask only that you compete for excellence, we will both be around twenty years from now.

Hon. Edward S. Blackstone and the Right to Medical Treatment

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Edward S. Blackstone, my constituent, has just been reelected as president of the Society of Medical Jurisprudence.

At their meeting on Monday, January 8, he gave a very interesting address on the subject of "The Fundamental Right to Medical Treatment," which I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues:

THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT TO MEDICAL TREATMENT

Fellow Officers, Trustees of the Society, Members and Guests. On behalf of myself and my colleagues, I wish to thank you all, for the confidence expressed, to again head the Society for another year. Last year I had the privilege to address the members of the Society and I discussed the world's legal systems.

Tonight I have chosen to present a discourse of the fundamental right to medical treatment. Whether the individual has the right to deny medical treatment and/or surgery to his or her progeny. Should the court intervene?

Frankly, the reason I have chosen this subject, is because I received through the mail a publication called "Awake" dated May 22, 1967 which is published by the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. I also was alerted by the news item [Christian Scientist Guilty in death of her daughter]. A Massachusetts jury has found Mrs. X, a Christian Scientist guilty of manslaughter in the death of her five year old daughter. It was the first case reported to have gone to trial (The AMA News, Aug. 28, 1967).

Mrs. X was tried in the death of her daughter, Lisa —, who died on March 18, 1967, apparently of pneumonia. Mrs. X did not call a physician, and instead relied upon prayer and the aid of a Christian Science practitioner.

A few weeks ago there were leaflets passed out in the Streets just outside this Hospital with this information: * * * ["Mrs. Y, Reader and Adviser on all problems. Has God given power to help all who are in need. * * * If you are sick or know any person who is; no matter what problem you may have, this gifted reader can and will help you."]

I shall only refer to the infant's natural right which is God given and to deny that child's natural right is morally wrong. Morality is an objective matter and failure to do so is an invasion of its natural right; so that where there is a wrong there is a remedy and the law steps in, to right the wrong.

In entering upon the discussion of the topic tonight, I want to make plain that I will only delve into the laws and legal interpretations and not as to the doctrines; philosophy; or religious implications of any religious belief, sect or cult that have been developed and promulgated.

Attention is called to the preamble to the Constitution of the U.S. It might be well to cite it.

"We, the people of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Poster-

ity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

I want to emphasize "promote the general welfare," in the State of New York under the provisions of the Revised Penal Law effective September 1, 1967 [§ 260.10 Endangering the Welfare of a Child]. A person is guilty of endangering the welfare of a child when:

1. He knowingly acts in a manner likely to be injurious to the physical, mental or moral welfare of a child less than sixteen years old; or

2. Being a parent, guardian or other person legally charged with the care or custody of a male child less than sixteen years old or of a female child less than eighteen years old, he fails or refuses to exercise reasonable diligence in the control of such child to prevent him from becoming a "neglected child," a "juvenile delinquent" or a "person in need of supervision," as those terms are defined in articles three and seven of the family court act.

Endangering the welfare of a child is a "Class A Misdemeanor".

§ 260.15 ENDANGERING THE WELFARE OF A CHILD: DEFENSE

In any prosecution for endangering the welfare of a child, pursuant to section 260.10, based upon an alleged failure or refusal to provide proper medical care of treatment to an ill child, it is an affirmative defense that the defendant (a) is a parent, guardian or other person legally charged with the care or custody of such child; and (b) is a member or adherent of an organized church or religious group the tenets of which prescribe prayer as the principal treatment for illness; and (c) treated or caused such ill child to be treated in accordance with such tenets; provided that the defendant may not avail himself of this defense when he has violated the laws, rules or regulations relating to communicable or reportable diseases and to sanitary matters.

However, § Defenses: Burden of Proof: [25.00] Penal Code:

"2. When a defense declared by statute to be an 'affirmative defense' is raised at a trial, the defendant has the burden of establishing such defense by a preponderance of evidence." [Laws of 1965, c. 1030 eff. Sept. 1, 1967]

In England under "Prevention of cruelty to Children Act" [1894] in The Queen v Senior. 1 Queens Bench Division (Dec. 10, 1898) 283 The prisoner was indicted and found guilty for the manslaughter of his child of eight or nine months. The child had died of diarrhoea and pneumonia * * *. The Medical evidence was that the child's life would certainly have been prolonged, and in all probability saved; if medical assistance had been procured. Wills J. stated at Page 284 "The prisoner was a member of a sect called 'The Peculiar People': whose religious doctrines as to the treatment of sick people are certainly to the ordinary apprehension remarkable. They base them on the Epistle of James, chapter V, 14th and 15th verses: 'Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him.' They do not allege that medical aid is here expressly forbidden, but say that to make use of it is to indicate a want of faith in the Lord. The learned judge inquired if they held that any other parts of the Scriptures—the Gospels, for instance—were of divine authority, and was answered that the Gospels certainly were so recognized. He also called attention to the fact that our Lord said, 'They that are whole need not a physician; but they who are sick' (1), and asked why they thought that it could be wrong to consult a physician, if the sick man was pronounced on such authority

to need a physician. The answer was that the sickness here alluded to was moral sickness or sin and that the physician meant our Lord Himself. The learned judge inquired, further, if they held that it was wrong to give extra food, or wine, or brandy, to a sick person, or to put an extra blanket on his bed if the weather were cold, or the nature of his sickness required him to be kept warm. The answer was, no, that they gave the sick every species of comfort and it appeared that the child had had much attention paid to its food and diet, though the medical witnesses did not think dietary altogether judicious, that it had had brandy administered.

One of the leading cases in this State is *People v. Pierson* (1903) 176 N.Y. 201. The defendant, a father, was indicted of violation of § 288 of the Penal Law (1881) which is similar to the one cited under the revised Penal Law eff. Sept. 1, 1967; and I would like to quote from J. Haight's opinion at page 207, "We are brought to a consideration of what is meant by the term 'medical attendance.' Does it mean a regularly licensed physician, or may some other person render 'medical attendance'? The foundation of medical science was laid by Hippocrates in Greece five hundred years before the Christian era. His discoveries, experiences and observations were further developed and taught in the schools of Alexandria and Salerno, and have come down to us through all the intervening centuries, yet medicine as a science made but little advance in northern Europe for many years thereafter; practically none until the dawn of the eighteenth century. After the adoption of Christianity by Rome and the conversion of the greater part of Europe, there commenced a growth of legends of miracles connected with the lives of great men who became benefactors of humanity. Some of these have been canonized by the church, and are today looked upon by a large portion of the Christian world as saints who had miraculous power. The great majority of miracles recorded had reference to the healing of the sick through Divine intervention and so extensively was this belief rooted in the minds of the people that for a thousand years or more it was considered dishonorable to practice physic or surgery. At the Lateran Council of the church, held at the beginning of the thirteenth century, physicians were forbidden, under pain of expulsion from the church, to undertake medical treatment without calling in a priest; and as late as two hundred and fifty years thereafter Pope Pius V renewed the command of Pope Innocent by enforcing the penalties. The curing by miracles, or by interposition of Divine power, continued throughout Christian Europe during the entire period of the Middle Ages, and was the mode of treating sickness recognized by the church. This power to heal was not confined to the Catholics alone, but was also in later years invoked by Protestants and by rulers. We are told that Henry VIII, Queen Elizabeth, the Stuarts, James I and Charles I, all possessed the power to cure epilepsy, scrofula and other diseases known as the king's evil; and there is incontrovertible evidence that Charles II, the most thorough debauchee who ever sat on the English throne, possessed this miraculous gift in a marked degree, and that for the purpose of effecting cures he touched nearly a hundred thousand persons.

With the commencement of the eighteenth century a number of important discoveries were made in medicine and surgery which effected a great change in public sentiment, and these have been followed by numerous discoveries of specifics in drugs and compounds. These discoveries have resulted in the establishment of schools for experiments and colleges throughout the civilized world for the special education of those who have chosen the practice of medicine for their profession. These schools and colleges have gone a long way in establishing medicine as a science, and such it has come to be recog-

nized in the law of our land. By the middle of the eighteenth century the custom of calling upon practitioners of medicine in case of serious illness had become quite general in England, France and Germany, and, indeed, to a considerable extent throughout Europe and in this country. From that time on the practice among the people of engaging physicians has continued to increase until it has come to be regarded as a duty, devolving upon persons having the care of others, to call upon medical assistance in case of serious illness. * * * In England the first statute upon the subject to which our attention has been called was that of 31 and 32 Vict. chapter 122, section 37, which made it the duty of persons having the care of infants to provide them with "medical aid." * * *

Formerly, no license or certificate was required of a person who undertook the practice of medicine. A certificate or diploma of an incorporated medical college was looked upon by the public as furnishing the necessary qualification for a person to engage in the practice of such profession. The result was that many persons engaged in the practice of medicine who had acquired no scientific knowledge with reference to the character of diseases or of the ingredients of drugs that they administered, some of whom imposed upon the public by purchasing diplomas from fraudulent concerns and advertising them as real. This resulted in the adoption of several statutes upon the subject. The first statute to which we call attention is chapter 513 of the Laws of 1880, in which every person, before commencing to practice physic and surgery, is required to procure himself to be registered in the office of the clerk of the county where he intends to practice, giving the authority under which he claims the right to engage in the profession, either by diploma or license, and making a violation of the provisions of the act a misdemeanor. Although this statute was an amendment of chapter 746 of the Laws of 1872, it is the first statute that we have found which prohibits the practice of medicine by any other than a person possessing a diploma from a medical college conferring upon him the degree of doctor of medicine, or a certificate from the constituted authorities giving him the right to practice. * * * We think, therefore, that the medical attendance required by the Code is the authorized medical attendance prescribed by the statute, and this view is strengthened from the fact that the third subdivision of this section of the Code requires nurses to report certain conditions of infants under two weeks of age "to a legally qualified practitioner of medicine of the city, town or place where such child is being cared for," thus particularly specifying the kind of practitioner recognized by the statute as a medical attendant.

The remaining question which we deem it necessary to consider is the claim that the provisions of the Code are violative of the provisions of the Constitution, article 1, section 3, which provides that "The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be allowed in this state to all mankind; and no person shall be rendered incompetent to be a witness on account of his opinions on matters of religious belief; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of this state." The peace and safety of the state involves the protection of the lives and health of its children as well as the obedience to its laws. Full and free enjoyment of religious profession and worship is guaranteed but acts which are not worship are not. A person cannot, under the guise of religious belief, practice polygamy and still be protected from our statutes constituting the crime of bigamy. He cannot, under the belief or profession of belief that he should be relieved from the care of children, be excused from

punishment for slaying those who have been born to him. Children when born into the world are utterly helpless, having neither the power to care for, protect or maintain themselves. They are exposed to all the ills to which flesh is heir, and require careful nursing, and at times, when danger is present, the help of an experienced physician. But the law of nature, as well as the common law, devolves upon the parents the duty of caring for their young in sickness and in health, and of doing whatever may be necessary for their care, maintenance and preservation, including medical attendance if necessary, and an omission to do this is a public wrong which the state, under its police powers, may prevent. The legislature is the sovereign power of the state. It may enact laws for the maintenance of order by prescribing a punishment for those who transgress. While it has no power to deprive persons of life, liberty or property without due process of law, it may, in case of the commission of acts which are public wrongs or which are destructive of private rights, specify that for which the punishment shall be death, imprisonment or the forfeiture of property. (*Burke v. People*, 3 Cow. 686-704; *Lawton v. Steele*, 119 N.Y. 226-236; *Thurlow v. Commonwealth of Mass.*, 5 How [U.S.] 504-583).

We are aware that there are people who believe that the Divine power may be invoked to heal the sick, and that faith is all that is required. There are others who believe that the Creator has supplied the earth, nature's storehouse, with everything that man may want for his support and maintenance, including the restoration and preservation of his health, and that he is left to work out his own salvation, under fixed natural laws. There are still others who believe that Christianity and science go hand in hand, both proceeding from the Creator; that science is but the agent of the Almighty through which he accomplishes results, and that both science and Divine power may be invoked together to restore diseased and suffering humanity. But, sitting as a court of law for the purpose of construing and determining the meaning of statutes, we have nothing to do with these variances in religious beliefs and have no power to determine which is correct. We place no limitations upon the power of the mind over the body, the power of faith to dispel disease, or the power of the Supreme Being to heal the sick.

It might be well to refer to the two amendments of the U.S. Constitution that the Jehovah Witnesses, Christian Science Practitioners allude to:

"AMENDMENT [1]"

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for redress of grievances."

"AMENDMENT XIV"

"SECTION 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

De Paul Review [1960] at page 272:

"Religious belief as guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States is not an absolute right. It is the right to worship as one pleases, but does not extend to practices inconsistent with the safety or peace of the state which includes the protection of the lives and health of its children. In *Reynolds v. United States* 98 U.S. 145 (1878) the court held that a party's religious belief cannot be accepted as a justification for his commit-

ting an overt act made criminal by the law of the land. *Prince v. Massachusetts* 121 U.S. 158 (1944)."

Chief Justice Waite delivered the opinion of the court at page 250:

"So here, as a law of the organization of society under the exclusive dominion of the United States, it is provided that plural marriages shall not be allowed. Can a man excuse his practices to the contrary because of his religious belief? To permit this would be to make the professed doctrines of religious belief superior to the law of the land, and in effect to permit every citizen to become a law unto himself. Government could exist only in name under such circumstances. In *Reynolds v. U.S.* (1878) 98 U.S. 245.

Raleigh Fitkin, Paul Morgan Memorial Hospital v. Anderson (1964) 42 N.J. 422:

"Per curiam. The plaintiff hospital brought an action in the Chancery Division of the Superior Court seeking authority to administer blood transfusions to the defendant Willmina Anderson in the event that such transfusions should be necessary to save her life and the life of her unborn child. The child is quick, the pregnancy being beyond the 32nd week. Mrs. Anderson had notified the hospital that she did not wish blood transfusions for the reason that they would be contrary to her religious conviction as a Jehovah's Witness. The evidence establishes a probability that at some point in the pregnancy Mrs. Anderson will hemorrhage severely and that both she and the unborn child will die unless a blood transfusion is administered.

"[1.2] The trial court held that the Judiciary could not thus intervene in the case of an adult or with respect to an unborn child. Because of the likely emergency we directed immediate argument of the hospital's appeal. At the argument we were advised that Mrs. Anderson left the hospital yesterday against the advice of the attending physician and the hospital. It is doubtful whether the hospital has a remaining interest but the parties request the court to determine the issues and since it is likely that the matter would arise again at the instance of an interested party we have decided to do so.

"[3] In *State v. Perricone*, 37 N.J. 463 (1962), we held that the State's concern for the welfare of an infant justified blood transfusions notwithstanding the objection of its parents who were also Jehovah's Witnesses, and in *Smith v. Brennan*, 31 N.J. 353 (1960), we held that a child could sue for injuries negligently inflicted upon it prior to birth. We are satisfied that the unborn child is entitled to the law's protection and that an appropriate order should be made to insure blood transfusions to the mother in the event that they are necessary in the opinion of the physician in charge at the time.

"We have no difficulty in so deciding with respect to the infant child. The more difficult question is whether an adult may be compelled to submit to such medical procedures when necessary to save his life. Here we think it is unnecessary to decide that question in broad terms because the welfare of the child and the mother are so intertwined and inseparable that it would be impracticable to attempt to distinguish between them with respect to the sundry factual patterns which may develop. The blood transfusions (including transfusions made necessary by the delivery) may be administered if necessary to save her life or the life of her child, as the physician in charge at the time may determine. In the *Prince* case: (321 U.S. at 166, 170).

"The right to practice religion freely does not include liberty to expose the community or child to communicable disease or the latter to ill health or death. * * * Parents may be free to become martyrs themselves. But it does not follow they are free, in identical circumstances, to make martyrs of their children before they have reached the age of full and legal discretion when they can make that

choice for themselves." In the interest of Kenneth Clark, 3 (1962) Court of Common Pleas, Ohio, 185 H.E.2d.128.

"[5] 5. The Biblical passages relied on to require vacation of the Court's emergency order were as follows: Genesis 9: 3, 4; Leviticus 3: 17; 17: 14; Deuteronomy 12: 23; Acts 15: 28, 29. To a layman unversed in the seemingly esoteric art of theological interpretation of the 17th century English version of ancient Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, these passages are, to say the least, somewhat obscure. They have to do with blood and the eating or taking thereof. Blood transfusion as administered by modern medicine was unknown to the authors of these cryptic dicta. Had its beneficent effects been known to them, it is not unlikely some exception would have been made in its favor especially by St. Luke who is said to have been a physician.

"But in our humble civil court we must confine ourselves to the civil law of the State. * * *

"But this right of theirs ends where somebody else's right begins. Their child is a human being in his own right, with a soul and body of his own. He has rights of his own—the right to live and to grow up without disfigurement.

"The child is a citizen of the State. While he 'belongs' to his parents, he belongs also to his State. Their rights in him entail many duties. Likewise the fact the child belongs to the State imposes upon the State many duties. Chief among them is the duty to protect his right to live and to grow up with a sound mind in a sound body, and to brook no interference with that right by any person or organization.

"When a religious doctrine espoused by the parents threatens to defeat or curtail such a right of their child, the State's duty to step in and preserve the child's right is immediately operative.

"To put it another way, when a child's right to live and his parents' religious belief collide, the former is paramount, and the religious doctrine must give way."

Thus, we have seen that we live in a secular society; the State, not only in the United States of America, but also in England—[zealously guards] the "general welfare" of its children against parents; whose so-called interpretation of the Scriptures of the Holy Bible conflicts with its laws, rules or regulations.

Gardner on Dissent

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, John W. Gardner has departed from his position as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Typical of the service he performed for this Nation as a member of the President's Cabinet are the following remarks he made in an article which appeared in the *New Leader*.

I include Mr. Gardner's comments at this point in the RECORD:

THE PERFECTIBILITY OF AMERICA?—NATION VIEWED ON "ROLLER COASTER OF ASPIRATION AND DISILLUSIONMENT"

(By John W. Gardner)

(John W. Gardner, to leave his post as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on March 1.)

The modern belief that man's institutions can accomplish just about anything he

wants, when he wants, has led to certain characteristic contemporary phenomena. One is the bitterness and anger that occurs when high hopes turn sour. No observer of the current scene has failed to note the cynicism prevalent today toward all leaders, all officials, all social institutions. That cynicism is led by the rage of people who expected too much in the first place and got too little in the end.

While aspirations are healthy in themselves, soaring hope followed by rude disappointment is a formula for trouble. It breeds leaders whose whole stock in trade is to exploit first the aspirations and then the disappointment. These men profit on both the ups and the downs of the market.

The roller coaster of aspiration and disillusionment is amusing to the extreme conservative, who thought the high hopes silly in the first place. It gives satisfaction to the Left-wing nihilist who thinks the whole system should be brought down anyway. It is a gold mine for mountebanks willing to promise anything and exploit every emotion. And it is a devastating whipsaw for serious and responsible leaders.

This leaves us with crucial and puzzling questions of public policy. How can we make sluggish institutions more responsive to human need and to the requirements of change? How can we mobilize our resources to meet the crises ahead?

How can we preserve our aspirations (the essence of social betterment) and at the same time develop the toughness of mind and spirit to face the fact that there are no easy victories? How can we make people understand that if they expect all good things instantly they will destroy everything? How do we tell them that they must maintain unrelenting pressure on their social institutions to accomplish beneficial change but must not, in a fit of rage, destroy those institutions? How can we caution them against exploitative leaders, leaders lustful for power or for the spotlight, leaders caught in their own vanity or emotional instability, leaders selling extremist ideologies? How can we diminish the resort to violence?

Violence cannot build a better society. No society can live in constant and destructive tumult. We will have either a civil order in which discipline is internalized in the breast of each free and responsible citizen, or sooner or later we will have repressive measures designed to re-establish order. The anarchist plays into the hands of the authoritarian. Those of us who find authoritarianism repugnant have a duty to speak out against all who destroy civil order. The time has come when the full weight of community opinion should be brought to bear on those who break the peace or seek to force decisions through mob action, or those who bypass established democratic procedures in favor of coercive demonstrations.

Dissent is an element of dynamism in our system. It is good that men expect much of their institutions, and good that their aspirations for improvement are ardent. But the elements of dynamism must have stabilizing counterparts. One is a tough-minded recognition that the fight for a better world is a long one, a recognition that retains high hopes while it immunizes against childish collapse or destructive rage in the face of disappointment. The other is an unswerving commitment to keep the public peace.

We also need something else. An increasing number of very bright and able people must become involved in the development of public policy. Ours is a difficult and exhilarating form of government, not for the faint of heart, not for the tidy-minded, and in these days of complexity, not for the stupid. America needs men and women who can bring to government the highest order of intellect, social motivations sturdy enough to withstand setbacks, and a resilience of spirit equal to the frustrations of public life and the difficulties of the days ahead.

A Guide to Speedy Mail Service for Our Servicemen Overseas

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of my special concerns with regard to our military commitment in Vietnam is the necessity for the best possible mail service for our gallant servicemen.

Twice I have traveled to Vietnam to

see for myself the provisions over there for handling the mail. I must say that there was a big improvement between my two visits.

Most important in handling servicemen's mail after it reaches the mailbox is proper preparation of the mail by the sender. Such preparation can save a lot of delays and other frustrations on both ends.

I commend to my colleagues a new pamphlet which has been prepared by the Post Office Department for free distribution in some 40,000 post offices and branches across the Nation.

"Mail for Servicemen: A Guide for Speeding Service" is a handy pamphlet that clearly explains the rules and rates.

There are details on the three services for airlifting parcels at rates the average family can afford, the speedy service now available for newspapers and news magazines to most overseas bases, the special rates for books and other educational materials, and how to mail sound-recorded personal messages.

Referring to the new services available, Postmaster General O'Brien said he hopes the new "guide will help more American families be familiar with these services and use them."

SENATE—Tuesday, March 19, 1968

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by Hon. ALBERT GORE, a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God, our Father, from the tumult of an angry, agitated world, we seek the sanctuary of Thy presence, not that we may escape from the world, but that we may turn to the perplexing maze of its tangled problems with strong spirits and quiet minds.

From the shams and shadows of these days, we pray for strength for our burdens, wisdom for our problems, insight for our times, and vision which sets our eyes on far horizons. And, above all and in all, undergird our faith with the conquering assurance that—

Under the shadow of Thy throne still may we dwell secure,
Sufficient is Thine arm alone, and our defense is sure.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1968.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ALBERT GORE, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GORE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings on Monday, March 18, 1968, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 16, 1968, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2419) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with respect to the development of cargo container vessels, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Lt. Gen. Jack G. Merrell (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general while so serving, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following committee and subcommittees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Committee on Public Works.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, on the extraordinary contractual adjustments and actions taken under project stabilization agreements, during the calendar year 1967; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the Agricultural Conservation Program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF DOMESTIC BANKS TO PAY INTEREST ON TIME DEPOSITS OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AT RATES DIFFERING FROM THOSE APPLICABLE TO DOMESTIC DEPOSITORS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the authority of domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign governments at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN NUMBER OF OFFICERS FOR THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the limitation on number of officers for the Coast Guard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, WITH RESPECT TO MEMBERS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of pro-